

209069

JPRS-TAC-87-045
2 JULY 1987



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Arms Control

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC DECLASSIFICATION

**Reproduced From
Best Available Copy**

REPRODUCED BY
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22161

19990113 094

35
121
A06

2 JULY 1987

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

RELATED ISSUES

Soviet Commentaries Previewing Warsaw Pact Meeting (Various sources, various dates)	1
Foreign Ministry Spokesman	1
PRAVDA Dispatch, by Ye. Grigoryev, M. Podklyuchnikov	4
Public Opinion Viewed, by S. Baygarov	6
Broadcast to North America, by Pavel Kuznetsov, et al.	7
USSR: Reportage on East Berlin Warsaw Pact Meeting (Various sources, various dates)	11
Gorbachev Leads Delegation	11
Agenda Noted	11
Press Interest Noted	12
Pre-Session News Conference	13
Falin, Chervov at News Conference	15
Honecker Opens Meetings	16
TASS Lists Participants	16
'Fresh Initiatives'	18
Pact Doctrine 'Defensive', by Aleksandr Zholkver	19
'New Political Thinking'	20
Document, Communique Issued	20
Text of Communique	21
Document on Pact Military Doctrine	29
Delegation Heads Meet	32
Honecker, Jaruzelski Dinner Speeches	33
'Hope' for NATO Response, by Yuriy Ulyanov	34

CPSU Politburo Discussion	35
Pact Secretary Briefs Press	36
Honecker Cited	36
Husak Cited	37
USSR Foreign Ministry Press Briefing	37
Deputy Foreign Minister Comments	38
Gromyko to CSSR Envoy	39
Shevardnadze Sees Spanish Ambassador	40
Soviet Commentaries Responding to Warsaw Pact Meeting (Various sources, various dates)	41
'International Observers Roundtable' 31 May, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, et al.	41
Vremya 31 May, by S. Alekseyev, et al.	48
IZVESTIYA Editorial	50
Moscow TV Commentary, by Tomas Kolesnichenko	52
'Studio 9' 4 June, by Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin	53
'International Situation: Questions and Answers', by Sergey Pravdin, et al.	64
'International Observers Roundtable' 7 June, by Boris Andrianov, et al.	66
FRG Officials View Pact Proposals (Hamburg DPA, 30 May 87)	69
FRG's Woerner Discusses Warsaw Pact Proposals (Ruediger Moniac; Bonn DIE WELT, 1 Jun 87)	70
FRG Press Views Warsaw Pact Summit Proposals (Various sources, various dates)	71
DIE WELT Comments, by Bernt Conrad	71
SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG Article	72
FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU Comments	72
FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE Editorial	73
International Physicians Congress Meets in Moscow (Various sources, various dates)	74
Gorbachev Sends Greetings	74
1st Day Activities	75
IZVESTIYA on Talks, U.S. Role, by B. Ivanov, V. Mikheyev	79
Gorbachev Meets Delegates	81
Joint Soviet-Japanese Exhibition on Nuclear Threat (A. Lyutyy; Moscow PRAVDA, 26 May 87)	85
PRAVDA Weekly Review: Pact Documents, INF (Igor Melnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 31 May 87)	86
Moscow Talk Show: Pact Documents, INF, SDI (Pavel Kuznetsov, et al.; Moscow in English to North America, 5 Jun 87)	90

IZVESTIYA on U.S., USSR Policies on Asian Security (Vikentiy Matveyev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 31 May 87)	95
Soviet General Defends Policy of Nuclear Retaliation (D. A. Volkogonov; Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, No 19, 6 May 87)	98
USSR: 'Illusions' in Nuclear Age Military Thinking (D. Volkogonov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 22 May 87)	101
Soviet Academician Links Sciences, New Thinking, 'Glasnost' (Vitaliy Goldanskiy; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 18, 11 May 87).	108
USSR: U.S. Opinion Seen Favoring Agreement With Soviets (Anatoliy A. Gromyko; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 26 May 87)	113

/9986

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTARIES PREVIEWING WARSAW PACT MEETING

Foreign Ministry Spokesman

LD261720 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1145 GMT 26 May 87

[Text] We offer you a broadcast entitled "The Warsaw Pact: A Reliable Instrument for Strengthening International Security." At the microphone is Boris Dmitriyevich Pyadyshev, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Agency.

[Pyadyshev] We are on the eve of the latest conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states. Soon, in Berlin, capital of the GDR, where at the moment the 750th anniversary of its founding is being celebrated, the top leaders of the seven allied states will congregate: Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

Each conference of the Political Consultative Committee is not only an important event in the lives of the states belonging to the defense organization of the Warsaw Pact. It is always an important international event. This was particularly so in the case of the meeting of the leaders of the constituent states held in June 1986 in Budapest, at which an Appeal from the Warsaw Pact states to the NATO states, and all European countries was adopted, with a program for the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons in Europe. The allied states then proposed a considerable reduction in all the components of the infantry and tactical strike aviation of the European states, and also in the corresponding forces and equipment of the United States and Canada deployed in Europe. In addition to conventional weapons, operational and tactical nuclear weapons with a range of up to 1,000 km would also have been liable to reduction. Moreover, the geographical zones of the reduction were announced as being the whole territory of Europe, from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Now here we have a new conference of the Political Consultative Committee. Much may be expected of it. This is a special time just now. Fruitful restructuring is going on in the internal and foreign policies of the Soviet Union; its breath is felt clearly beyond the boundaries of our country, and it is exerting a positive influence on the European situation and on the whole world position. It may be supposed that when they meet in Berlin, the leaders of the allied socialist states will painstakingly examine the situation in Europe and the world, and will analyze the key European and international issues. The starting point for this analysis is the conviction that now, in the nuclear age, there is no task more important than averting war and the maintenance of peace. In the solution of this task, the far-reaching Soviet initiatives in the field of nuclear and space weapons are of principle importance, starting with the historic program for a nuclear-free world put forward on 15 January last year. The Soviet initiatives provide clear guidelines.

I should like, in particular, to emphasize that the allied socialist states fully support all our proposals. That support and that solidarity with Moscow's initiatives intensify their effectiveness. This has yet again, quite clearly, been illuminated during the present visit by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to Romania.

After Reykjavik the situation was that, from the whole package of issues of nuclear and space weapons, the issue of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe stood out from the point of view of the chance of an accord being reached quickly.

The Soviet leadership, by agreement with its ally states, on 28 February this year spoke out in favor of separating the medium-range missiles from the package of problems and of reaching a separate agreement on these armaments. And now, at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, the USSR delegation has a firm mandate to embark upon the elaboration of a specific accord on a whole series of key issues, above all, on the elimination in the next 5 years of all Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, with the retention of only 100 warheads apiece on such missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union and on the territory of the United States.

The question is being asked: Why did the Soviet Union agree to the retention of 100 warheads apiece on these missiles? This is, it should be said, the well-known compromise. The U.S. Administration is trying to keep nuclear arms deployed against the Soviet Union in Asia, and this obliges us to seek a response. At the same time, the Soviet leadership has, on a number of occasions, stated its readiness to solve the problem of medium-range missiles on a global basis. There would have been no obstacles to such a solution had the United States agreed to the elimination of its nuclear arms in Japan, South Korea and the Philippines, and also agreed to the withdrawal of its aircraft carrier flotilla beyond an agreed boundary. Of course, the United States would not have had medium-range missiles on its own territory. The Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks has a mandate to strive for a quick accord regarding the elimination of Soviet and American operational and tactical missiles in Europe, the establishment of the strictest verification system [sistema kontrolya], right up to on-site inspection, and the fulfillment of the obligations accepted by both sides on this account.

The Soviet Union, as follows from the Budapest program, has also proposed that the issue of tactical nuclear means in Europe including tactical missiles, be examined and tackled at separate, multilateral talks. Moscow has proposed to the U.S. side that the key provisions regarding strategic strike weapons, antimissile defense and nuclear tests be worked out. Together with the signing of a treaty on medium-range missiles, these agreements could be a subject for accord at the highest level and the basis on which legally binding agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States would be prepared. Is the U.S. side ready, is NATO ready to act as dynamically as the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact member states? In Washington and other NATO capitals, statements of cautious optimism may be heard just now on the possibility of concluding an agreement on medium-range missiles. At the same time, the maneuvering of the opponents of accord is clear for all to see. Incidentally, it is evident their arguments are progressively losing their substance and persuasiveness, and are turning into pressurizing [nazhimyye] and unsubstantiated declarations.

Today I should like to recall something else that has to do with anniversaries. Exactly 15 years ago, on 26 May, 1972 a treaty was signed in Moscow on the restriction of antimissile defense systems. About the same time, some other Soviet-U.S. agreements were concluded, and in all seven joint Soviet-U.S. documents were signed. Unfortunately, only a very few of those agreements have survived to our times. The U.S. Administration has, for one reason or another, finished with most of the documents. Now, it would seem, they have set about in earnest to deprive the ABM Treaty of any sense, or even to scrap it altogether. The socialist states work on the basis that the process of reducing military confrontation in Europe should be a continuous one, and should, at every stage, ensure equilibrium at the level of reasonable sufficiency. Of course, as a result of historic, geographical and other factors, an asymmetry has developed in Europe in the armed forces of the two sides. Taking this into account, the allied countries voice their readiness to eliminate, in the course of reduction, the inequality in certain elements by means of a corresponding reduction on the side that is ahead, but not on account of a build-up on the side lagging behind.

The task of lessening the confrontation of the NATO armed forces and the Warsaw Pact in certain regions of Europe would be in line with the implementation of the proposals of a number of Allied states on the creation on the continent of zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons. A substantial role could be played by the fulfilment of the proposal of Czechoslovakia and the GDR concerning a non-nuclear corridor along the line of contact between the Warsaw Pact and NATO with a width of 300 km.

The allied states believe that the issue of military doctrines is an issue of no little importance for an assessment of the true intentions of military-political groupings, as indeed of individual states. Now this issue is acquiring a particular topicality. It is essential to remove the mutual suspicion and lack of trust, to thoroughly get to grips with the anxieties of one another on this question. In the interests of security in Europe and the whole world, the military conceptions and doctrines of the military alliances should be based on defensive principles. As far as the military doctrine of the allied socialist states is concerned, it presupposes the maintenance of equilibrium of the armed forces at the lowest possible level, and the reduction of the military potentials to the limits of reasonable sufficiency. That is, to the limits that are necessary exclusively for defense.

The upcoming Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee will, without doubt, stress the topicality of the efforts of the allied states toward putting an end to the division of the continent into opposing military blocs, and toward strengthening the bridges of cooperation between Eastern and Western Europe. Bulgaria, for example, proposes holding an ecological forum, at which specific steps to maintain and protect the environment of our continent could be discussed and worked out. Hungary actively backs an extension of the cultural exchanges between the peoples of Europe. Poland has put forward a package plan for the reduction of armaments and the deepening of trust in Central Europe. An active proponent of the politics of peace is Romania. Together with Bulgaria, it is the initiator of the creation on the Balkan peninsula of a zone free from nuclear and chemical weaponry.

Today's Warsaw Pact is a dynamic and effective association of allied states. the mechanism of interaction works smoothly between all the countries. It has now become a rule that conferences of the Political Consultative Committee are held at least once a year. The Committee of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meets twice a year. The ministers of defense of the allied states meet regularly. I particularly wanted to note that at various levels -- at the level of ministers, of deputy ministers, of experts

from the most varied ministries -- active, rich consultations, discussions and exchanges of opinion are held. The socialist countries are striving for greater dynamism in their foreign political cooperation, for a further improvement in its machinery, for the strict observance of the principles of equality and mutual responsibility in the system of political relations between states.

The upcoming Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee is awaited by the world as a major, international event. An international press center has begun functioning in Berlin, and numerous representatives of the European and world press are now converging on the GDR capital. There is no doubt that this meeting of the leaders of the allied socialist states, and the decisions adopted at the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee will justify the hope that the struggle for the consolidation of European security and international cooperation will unfold with renewed strength.

PRAVDA Dispatch

PM281001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 May 87 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev and M. Podklyuchnikov: "Berlin Meeting"]

[Excerpts] Berlin, 27 May -- [passage omitted] The last Political Consultative Committee conference was held in Budapest. It took place nearly a year ago: on 10-11 June. The conference supported the program put forward by the Soviet Union for the total elimination of weapons of mass annihilation. [paragraph continues]

The most important result of its work was the Warsaw Pact states' appeal to the NATO states and all European countries with the program for reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe. The fraternal countries' joint document substantially added to and reinforced the program for the total elimination of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass annihilation. The world is widely acquainted with the USSR's numerous initiatives which are paving a real path for reducing and totally eliminating nuclear and other types of weapons of mass annihilation, preventing the spread of the arms race into space, and ending nuclear tests.

Proposals for the creation of zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons are connected with the GDR and the CSSR, Romania and Bulgaria. Poland's comprehensive plan for reducing armaments and building confidence in Central Europe was also recently made public. The fraternal countries jointly submitted to the United Nations an initiative relating to the creation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security. It was they who suggested to the NATO Members the idea of a moratorium on increasing military expenditure. And they recently issued a joint statement with proposals whose aim is to promote the completion of the drafting of a convention on banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

All this reflects the restructuring which is also having an effect in the foreign policy sphere. "The atmosphere of comradely mutual understanding and creativity is strengthening, providing for each person's heightened initiative in implementing the socialist community countries' jointly elaborated line. Taking this dynamic into account, we can expect the Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin to lend even greater activeness to their efforts on all the main salients of the struggle for a Europe of stable security and good-neighborly cooperation.

A realistic assessment of the international situation is complex. In Europe, thanks to the Soviet proposals, and above all those aimed at clearing the continent of nuclear weapons, there is now a unique change of turning the course of events toward disarmament and trust. It is up to the United States and the NATO countries. And they seem to want to disown their former statements about their desire for nuclear disarmament, a world with fewer arms, and so forth.

In Berlin you only have to switch to the West Berlin television channel to be convinced of the furor which the proposal for the elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles is generating among, for instance, influential ruling circles in the nearby FRG.

There are many examples of the overt and concealed reluctance of certain circles in the NATO countries to disarm. That is why it is more important than ever to mobilize the efforts of the peace-loving states and all people of good will in the struggle to ensure that the chance opened up by the enterprising Soviet policy is not let slip.

The Warsaw Pact states are pioneers in the matter of ensuring peace. They are blazing new trails, proposing bold, extraordinary solutions to existing problems, bringing a constructive spirit to international affairs.

In Berlin everything is ready for the start of the work of the Political Consultative Committee conference. Our German friends attach great importance to the conference. GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman Wolfgang Mayer [surname as published] said that it is expected that the Berlin conference will have extraordinary importance for the normalization of the complex and tense international situation.

In the Berlin international press center the list of accredited newspaper, agency, and radio and television representatives already numbers hundreds of names. The list of their places of "registration" covers the whole world.

We learned from informed circles that the main questions to be discussed at the Political Consultative Committee's Berlin conference will be problems of disarmament, the creation of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, and the formation of an all-encompassing system of international security. And that is the main thing which interests and perturbs the European and world public today. The influx of the press into Berlin is a sure sign that important decisions, concepts, and impulses are expected from the conference of the top leaders of the socialist states.

An analysis of the situation in Europe and throughout the world and the coordination of urgent foreign policy actions will serve the cause of peace and security. Our fraternal countries have no concern in international relations other than concern to prevent a nuclear catastrophe, to save mankind, and to assert a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. That is the main aim of their policy. And in Berlin this will undoubtedly be reaffirmed with great conviction.

Public Opinion Viewed

PM291013 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 87 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by special correspondents S. Baygarov, Ye. Grigoryev, and M. Podklyuchnikov: "For the Sake of Peace on Earth"]

[Excerpt] Berlin, 28 May -- [passage omitted] The German socialist state is a factor for peace in the center of Europe. The Soviet Union, the GDR, and all the Warsaw Pact countries have a common philosophy of peace. They are in favor of ending the dangerous rivalry in stockpiling weapons, in favor of disarmament.

The conference of the allied countries' leaders is the chief topic in GDR newspapers and on television and radio. It attracts the attention of the republic's public.

At the head enterprise of the "Oberspree" Cable Combine, in Berlin Peter Kelkh [name as published] leader of the K. Marx youth team, told us:

"Mankind's further life is inconceivable without lasting peace. The Warsaw Pact states' initiatives serve to uphold and strengthen it. It is time Western governments responded to them with action. Material resources must be expended not on creating more and more new arms but on the struggle against hunger, poverty, and ignorance, for the good of working people."

General Gerhard Kuehl from Brandenburg said:

"People in our country very highly rate M.S. Gorbachev's efforts in the struggle to strengthen peace. They are impressed by the strenuous work of the Soviet leadership, which has advanced a number of new proposals aimed at disarmament. These concern both nuclear and conventional weapons. I am sure that this Political Consultative Committee conference will again give a great boost to the struggle for peace. The most urgent question at present -- the question of lasting peace -- must be and can be solved reliably and forever."

While the Warsaw Pact states' leaders are analyzing the contemporary situation in Europe and the world and discussing possible foreign policy steps, an "exchange of opinions" is taking place in the international press center. It is at once apparent that the chief question of concern to the European and world public now is the question of whether a unique opportunity will be utilized, medium-range missiles will be eliminated on our continent, and the first major step taken toward a nuclear-free Europe.

Unfortunately, there are still many difficulties on this path, including those artificially heaped up by certain NATO states. "Residents" of the press center could not fail to notice yesterday a report from Brussels that the defense ministers of the North Atlantic bloc countries had advocated a further increase in spending on arms. This shows the real worth of Western assurances of a desire for disarmament!

Briefings and news conferences provide abundant food for thought and for comparing viewpoints here. For two evenings in succession journalists' meetings with Soviet experts have filled the hall. You see for yourself over and over again how great is the demand for authentic, accurate, detailed information about the Soviet Union's policy and initiatives. These conversations continued. You can see from some questions from our Western colleagues how difficult it is to overcome chronic stereotypes and how strong the desire to dig up "dirt" ["zharenoye"] in the spirit of the "cold" war still is. However, the times are getting their way -- and the growing interest in the views and proposals of the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries can be seen at such meetings.

"I think," Ricardo Erman [name as published] a correspondent for Italy's ANSA news agency, told us, "that the decisions of your alliance's conference will benefit peace."

The expectation of our friends from fraternal countries is quite definite. Bohumil Horak, a Czechoslovak radio journalist, believes that the Political Consultative Committee conference will undoubtedly leave a profound mark on international life. This has always been the case. The socialist countries' peace offensive is gathering momentum and giving strong boosts to the struggle against the threat of nuclear destruction. The initiatives of the Soviet Union and the other fraternal socialist states are receiving growing support throughout the planet.

Broadcast to North America

LD301512 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 29 May 87

["Top Priority" program presented by Pavel Kuznetsov with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of Moscow's United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Excerpts] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Pavel Kuznetsov presenting "Top Priority," a weekly panel discussion from the North American service of Radio Moscow. Together with me in the studio are Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov both of Moscow's United States of America and Canada Institute. And, the topic for today's discussion is a 2-day summit meeting of the Warsaw Treaty known as a conference, a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, which concluded its work in Berlin, the German Democratic Republic.

One of the proposals made at this 2-day summit was to compare military defense doctrines of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO and discuss them by the end of the year, perhaps in Brussels or Warsaw or by way of alternating between the armed forces of two alliances. So I would like you, Professor Bogdanov to start the ball rolling by saying what are the main points of the document adopted during the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee.

[Bogdanov] Maybe for the first time we suggest in such a comprehensive way to our Western partners to discuss doctrine, what we call software. You know, so far we're very busy with the hardware. So, first of all, we say once again that our doctrine is purely defensive but if the other side has some doubts about it, some questions, we are ready for a meeting of both sides to discuss which doctrine is what and to find out a common ground. We come again, in a more comprehensive way than ever, to the problem of conventional--I don't mention, you know, deliberately, INF, you know, medium-range and operational and battlefield--I just would like to call attention....

[Kuznetsov] Okay, we'll discuss that issue with Sergey.

[Bogdanov] Oh yes, you can discuss it. He's sitting here, you can discuss it with him. But I would like, you know, and I believe that the most important point for our listeners is (?this whole) conventional (?business) because we have the agreement within our reach. Maybe for the first time in the history of the arms talks, we can strike a deal within a very short time. It's on the table, you know. You have two draft treaties, very near by but of course with differences, but you have a major difference which is the American allies' position. In any case, our American partners (words indistinct), they are waiting for the final answer for their Western allies. And the final answer is little bit, you know, difficult for them, because of one major problem -- the superiority of the Soviet Union in the conventional field.

[Kuznetsov] Just let me say...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I wouldn't like, that's what they say. But there is a very clear statement that there is a rough equality in conventional business, too, but...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] But at the same time we do admit that there are disparities on both sides....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Exactly.

[Kuznetsov] ...and this is one of the questions that we discussed during the Berlin summit.

[Bogdanov] Yes. During the Berlin summit, we call their attention again to our readiness to discuss it, to start discussions on conventional problem immediately. And mind you, what we mean by conventional field, that is, the area between Atlantic and Urals.

[Kuznetsov] And the Urals, yes.

[Bogdanov] Urals. And maybe never we clearly stated in such a way that our territory is also open for discussion, not only theirs.

[Kuznetsov] And not only for discussion but for inspection.

[Bogdanov] For inspection, you know. By the way Pavel, what little bit worries me about the honesty of the other side, you know -- they were acting as if the Soviet, as if the May Budapest proposals were not existing at all. One year...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] You mean the similar summit which was held in the last year in Budapest, Hungary?

[Bogdanov] Yes, last year, and the main, you know, paper of the Budapest summit was our proposal on conventional arms, where we have suggested, we produced a call for reductions of up to 150,000 troops on each side within 1 or 2 years. Further cuts could trim forces by about a million by the year 1990. I wonder whether general staffs of NATO alliance are aware of that proposal. Of course, they are. They are, literally speaking, they are hiding that proposal from the public opinion of the Western countries. Now it is very much in our proposals. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] Sergey, I understand that the West is closing in, or moving closer, to a consensus on INF. You recall that Great Britain has endorsed the idea behind, that is, that Soviet and American missiles should be eliminated in Europe and that both sides could be left with 100 warheads in Soviet Asia and on U.S. territory respectively, but out of reach of each other. We're still awaiting word from West Germany and Chancellor Kohl is expected to announce his final position on that issue early in June and hopefully at the Venice summit, also to be held in June. We will hear where NATO stands on the overall issue. But in this connection, I would like you to comment on the political background against which those INF talks are being held. On the one hand, like I said, the West is moving closer to a joint stand on this very important issue. But on the other hand, the psychological atmosphere that's been created is such that one gets the feeling that as if on the next day after an INF accord is signed the Soviets will attack Western Europe, which is supposed to be absolutely defenseless, although some 4,000 nuclear warheads will still be left....

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Will still be there.

[Kuznetsov] Will still be there and there's a lot with which the...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] So the chance to destroy Europe will not disappear.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah. How would you explain this hesitancy? Ambivalence?

[Plekhanov] I would explain it as inertia in thinking on the part of Western Europeans in the NATO governments, because they are so used to having nuclear weapons -- some countries in NATO have their own nuclear weapons, others like West Germany have other countries' nuclear weapons on their soil. They are prisoners of this idea of nuclear deterrence, of the idea that peace in Europe has been kept for 40 years because there are nuclear weapons. Now, but also the greatest threats of war have appeared because of those same nuclear weapons and the governments in Western Europe are in a very difficult situation.

The public opinion in Western Europe is swinging in favor of making Europe nuclear-free, free of nuclear weapons, and that is a very, very strong demand. In Britain, in West Germany, even in France antinuclear sentiment is growing. Then if we look at the other side of the Atlantic, in Washington, there is a considerable interest in reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union on removing INF's from Europe. And this situation gives me hope that with all the hemming and hawing the NATO governments will have to support; I mean, if President Reagan and Secretary Gorbachev can agree on this issue, I can't see Chancellor Kohl or some other Western European leader playing, you know, the spoiler in this kind of situation. I don't think that politically that would be acceptable in those countries.

And still, the inertia is still there. There must be a breakthrough to new thinking. The idea that without nuclear weapons the Soviet Union will tomorrow, you know, send its armies to the West is preposterous. You not only can't fight a nuclear war in Europe, you can't fight a conventional war in Europe without eliminating Europe as a continent because of the existence of numerous nuclear power plants which will be inevitably hit by conventional forces. And so we must find a way of doing away with those unnecessary mountains of weapons on the Continent of Europe.

[Kunznetsov] Professor Bogdanov, I suspect that some of the political opposition in the United States and Western Europe to an INF accord, which some people say is quite in sight, can be explained by the fact that should this accord be signed and honored by both sides the overall political climate would change and the atmosphere would become conducive to further steps in this direction -- I mean in the direction of arms control, effective arms control -- and perhaps, in my view, some people, there are people in the West who may not be prepared for such a turn of events. Would you agree with such an assessment?

[Bogdanov] Yes, I would agree with that assessment, though I have some more suspicions and we will, if you like, discuss them some other time. But I believe that's the main, major problem in all that. Because if we strike a deal on INF that will, you know, block the road for another, you know, deployment of any nuclear weapons in Europe. Once you did it, it's very difficult to come back to that. Then, you know, you have a problem with the Congress, I believe. If you strike a deal, what if you have a quite new atmosphere, environment? Why, what (?the hell), do you need billions, billions of dollars? What for?

[Kuznetsov] Does the United States Administration want an INF accord with the Soviet Union?

[Plekhanov] Yes, it does want an accord, I think, for a number of reasons. But there are some conditions which the United States still continues to attach to that accord.

[Kuznetsov] What are those strings that you ...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] There are, there is one thing, one big difference has to do with the fate of those 100 missiles still which will be left in the Asian part of the Soviet Union and on the territory of the United States.

[Kuznetsov] And my final question to you, Sergey, as time is running out on us: Do believe that these obstacles are surmountable, that they can be negotiated?

[Plekhanov] Yes, yes, provided there is political will they are surmountable because we are for a serious effort, a long-term effort to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

And we are prepared, as I think we have proven amply, to deal in a flexible manner. We are prepared to make concessions, to wait for the next phase. We are prepared to leave some solutions for the next phases and so on. And the same applies to this idea on INF. But what we have now is the making of a deal which is acceptable to both sides and that is a double zero for Europe. No INF's Europe, no tactical nuclear missiles in Europe.

[Kuznetsov] Our time is up. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for joining us in the studio. I am Pavel Kuznetsov. We have come to the end of "Top Priority." The best listening to you and goodbye.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1520

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: REPORTAGE ON EAST BERLIN WARSAW PACT MEETING

Gorbachev Leads Delegation

LD271242 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1200 GMT 27 May 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] Members of the Soviet delegation today left Moscow for Berlin to take part in a routine conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states. The delegation is headed by Comrade Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In the delegation are: Comrades Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Shevardnadze, and Sokolov. At the airport the delegation was seen off by Comrades Ligachev, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Demichev, Talyzin, and other comrades.

In the seeing-off party was Koenig, GDR ambassador to the USSR.

Agenda Noted

PM270915 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 May 87 First Edition p 1

[TASS report under the rubric "Across Countries and Continents": "Statement by GDR Foreign Ministry Spokesman"]

[Text] Berlin, 26 May -- The forthcoming Berlin conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee will be of extremely great significance with regard to improving the tense, complex international situation. This was said by a GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman at a news conference here.

The discussion of key issues on whose solution the very existence of human civilization depends in the nuclear-space age will be on the conference agenda, he stressed. It is a question of practical steps and measures to limit arms and bring about disarmament and to create a nuclear-free world and a comprehensive international security system. This concerns proposals to sharply reduce all types of arms and armed forces.

Neither now nor in the future can any state ensure its security by military means alone. This is increasingly becoming a task to be resolved by political means. For this to happen it is also essential to establish a climate of trust between states with different social systems. The conference, which will confirm the exclusively defensive

nature of the Warsaw Pact, will devote particular attention to this issue. Understanding and trust are now a reliable basis for peaceful relations in Europe and beyond its borders. We hope, the GDR Foreign Ministry spokesman emphasized, that the decisions taken by the Berlin conference will inspire all forces of reason and realism and we are confident that they will open up broad scope for continuing political dialogue with all who want to contribute to strengthening peace.

The GDR, he said, is sure that the Berlin conference will also help to further develop political cooperation within the Warsaw Pact and intensify and strengthen collaboration between socialist countries.

Press Interest Noted

LD271835 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 27 May 87

[Text] Our special correspondent Aleksandr Zholkver reports from Berlin:

[Zholkver] The latest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meets in the GDR capital tomorrow. This afternoon the leading figures of the Warsaw Pact member states arrived in Berlin. The Soviet delegation is led by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The delegation includes Comrades Gromyko, Ryzhkov, Shevardnadze, Sokolov, and Medvedev. At Berlin's Shoenefeld airport, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the members of the Soviet delegation were cordially greeted by Comrade Honecker and other leaders of the GDR.

Interest in the forthcoming meeting of the Warsaw Pact organization's political leadership is enormous. Over 350 foreign journalists were accredited at the international press center in Berlin on the first day it was open. With great attention they are acquainting themselves with the materials of the official friendly visit by Comrade Gorbachev to Romania, which has just ended. His speech at the meeting in Bucharest was relayed in full by GDR television. The journalists gathered in the press center noted particularly in their reports that at the session of the Political Consultative Committee in Berlin it is planned to jointly analyze the situation in Europe and throughout the world, and agree on urgent and joint foreign policy moves.

Berlin's papers today particularly stress that the agenda is headed by the question of eliminating nuclear missiles in Europe, as well as the adoption of other nuclear disarmament and conventional arms reduction measures, and measures to prevent the arms race extending into space.

The Soviet Union's position on all times most important issues is elucidated by Soviet experts who come to Berlin and are speaking in the international press center.

In the GDR capital everything is ready for the start of the Political Consultative Committee's work. The session will be held in the Palast-Hotel, which is situated in the very center of the city. At the moment Berlin is solemnly celebrating its 750th birthday. The GDR capital bears the honored title of "City of Peace", and all the Berliners I have had occasion to speak with express confidence that the new meeting of the leaders of the socialist community will be an important contribution to strengthening peace and security on the European continent and throughout the world.

Pre-Session News Conference

LD280824 Moscow TASS in English 0814 GMT 28 May 87

[Text] Berlin May 28 TASS -- A meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states opens in Berlin today.

This event was the subject of a press conference given here Wednesday night by Soviet foreign-policy experts.

Taking part in the press conference and answering journalists' questions were Albert Vlasov, first deputy head of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, and Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY.

The experts emphasised that attempts by the Western side to cling to the old political thinking and to the concept of nuclear deterrence was one of the main obstacles to achieving real progress in the field of disarmament.

They said renunciation of the concept would undoubtedly promote headway towards a solution to many acute problems, among them the issue of medium-range nuclear missiles.

Some difficulties at the Soviet-U.S. talks are rooted in the U.S. stance while other ones are rooted in the stands of its allies.

In particular, the Federal Republic of Germany, first of all, has not up to now finally defined its position as regards the shorter-range weapons with a range of more than 500 kilometres.

There are also ambiguities in the stands of a number of other allies of the United States. As far as the United States itself is concerned, difficulties proceed from the fact that that power would like not to eliminate their "Pershing-2" missiles in Western Europe but to convert them into shorter-range missiles by removing the missile's second stage.

The non-constructive nature of such an approach is clear already because it would take not more than 45 minutes to reconvert the shorter-range missiles into Pershing-2 ones by adding the second stage to them.

Besides, the speakers pointed out, the United States would like not to eliminate land-based cruise missiles but to convert them into sea-launched ones.

Neither is the USA prepared to undertake to deploy medium-range missiles on its national territory so they would not reach the territory of the USSR.

Finally, the United States would prefer a reduction in medium-range missiles at the first stage to apply only to the Soviet Union whereas the elimination of American missiles in the European zone would begin only at the second stage.

According to such "logic", measures to verify the observance of the accord at the first stage should be carried out only with regard to the Soviet Union while the United States would be free from any control by national and international means and, the more so, from on-site inspections.

It is perfectly clear that this demand has nothing in common with the principles of equality and equal security and cannot be accepted.

At the same time the Soviet experts voiced hope that such difficulties in the U.S. stand would not create insurmountable obstacles to reaching an appropriate agreement.

A number of journalists' questions dealt with the issues of cutbacks in conventional weapons.

In this connection it was pointed out that, unfortunately, the proposals put forward in this field by socialist countries had not found a positive reaction from the West up to now, a year after an address to this effect had been issued in Budapest.

On the contrary, the defence ministers of NATO countries have decided to increase their expenditures on conventional arms. Moreover, it is precisely against this background of this decision that a thesis according to which the Soviet Union could unilaterally withdraw its armed forces from the territories of a number of allied countries is beginning to be floated about in the West.

What is the logic of such a stand? The Soviet Union and its allies are ready to discuss all issues at the negotiating table, and as soon as possible. They are ready to consider the issue of reducing conventional arms separately from nuclear arms, within the context of tactical and theatre weapons.

For one year and a half the Soviet Union was unilaterally adhering to a moratorium on the tests of nuclear weapons. However, none of these opportunities have found a response on the part of NATO countries so far.

As far as shorter-range missiles with a range of up to 500 km are concerned, it is impossible to speak of their cutbacks in isolation from conventional arms, for they are intended for the utilisation of both nuclear and conventional systems. If these are artificially brought apart from each other, a respective agreement would prove unreliable from the very outset. It would hardly promote relaxation of tension in the military field.

The joint proposal by the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia on establishing a nuclear-free corridor in Central Europe is of substantial importance in this context.

The Soviet Union supports this initiative, just as in general the idea of establishing zones free from nuclear weapons. However, the Western side has not given a constructive reply to it so far.

Soviet experts pointed out that the results of the just-concluded Soviet-Romanian talks in Bucharest reflected the socialist countries' striving to make a constructive contribution to the process of improving the international situation, and to muster up all existing resources with this end in view.

The Political Consultative Committee's meeting opening in the capital of the GDR will be undoubtedly imbued with the same aspiration. This reflects the socialist countries' new foreign-policy philosophy which is based on the new political thinking and new understanding of a whole number of issues of international life.

Falin, Chervov at News Conference

LD271442 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0726 GMT 27 May 87

[Text] Berlin, 27 May (TASS) -- A news conference by Soviet foreign policy experts devoted to the USSR's basic positions on disarmament issues was held in the GDR capital on Tuesday. It was arranged on the eve of the Warsaw Pact member states' Political Consultative Committee conference which opens 28 May in Berlin.

Speaking at the news conference, Valentin Falin, chairman of the board of APN, said that mankind today is in a critical phase of development. The decisions which are taken or are not taken in the very near future will determine a very great deal for Europe, for other regions and for human civilization in general. Whether to halt the arms race, or to open up new spheres for it, including space, thus dooming mankind to unforeseeable consequences -- the question of which of these paths the states will take will in essence be decided in the coming weeks and months. It is precisely over that time that it will become clear whether the U.S. Administration and its NATO allies are ready not for talks, but for a stage-by-stage resolution of the problem in the name of a safer and more stable world.

Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, head of a directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, expressed profound concern in connection with the arms race that continues despite the will of the peoples, and which threatens to spread into space. However, the major Soviet foreign policy initiatives open up the possibility of halting this dangerous process. Favorable circumstances have now been created at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons to come to agreement on radical reduction of nuclear weapons. Attainment of an agreement on elimination of medium range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe would be the first major step in real nuclear disarmament. As far as the matter of preventing an arms race in space is concerned, the United States is unwilling to negotiate on this topic.

Replying to correspondents' questions, Nikolay Chervov emphasized the great importance of the joint proposal from the GDR and CSSR to form a nuclear-free corridor in Central Europe. Implementation of the initiative, he said, would promote the creation of an atmosphere of trust among European countries and the strengthening of security in Europe.

Honecker Opens Meetings

LD281532 Moscow TASS in English 28 May 87

[Text] Berlin May 28 TASS -- The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states began its regular meeting in the capital of the German Democratic Republic today.

Erich Honecker opened the meeting with a brief speech of welcome.

Three sessions were held. They were chaired in turn by Mikhail Gorbachev, head of the Soviet delegation, Gustav Husak, head of the Czechoslovak delegation, and Todor Zhivkov, head of the Bulgarian delegation.

Gorbachev, Wojciech Jaruzelski, Janos Kadar, Nicolae Ceausescu, Zhivkov, Husak, and Honecker made statements.

The Political Consultative Committee, at the meeting proceeding in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely business-like cooperation, is examining the situation in Europe and the world at large, including questions of preventing nuclear war, defusing tension in Europe and promoting the all-European process, tasks in the struggle for restructuring international relations on the basis of a new way of political thinking rejecting militarism and the cult of force.

It is also discussing questions of enhancing cooperation on matters of foreign policy within the framework of the Warsaw Treaty and coordinating urgent joint actions in the world arena.

The Political Consultative Committee will continue its meeting tomorrow.

TASS Lists Participants

PM291121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Conference of Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee"]

[Text] Berlin, 28 May -- A scheduled conference of the Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee began work today in the capital of the GDR.

Taking part in the conference are:

From the People's Republic of Bulgaria -- T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee, chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, and head of the delegation; G. Atanasov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers; D. Dzhurov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee and Bulgarian minister of national defense; M. Balev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee; P. Mladenov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee and Bulgarian minister of foreign affairs;

From the Hungarian People's Republic -- J. Kadar, general secretary of the MSZMP and head of the delegation; G. Lazar, member of the Politburo of the MSZMP Central Committee and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers; M. Szuros, secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee; P. Varkonyi, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian minister of foreign affairs; F. Karpati, member of the MSZMP Central Committee and Hungarian minister of defense;

From the German Democratic Republic -- E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, chairman of the GDR Council of State, and head of the delegation; W. Stoph, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; H. Axen, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee; E. Krenz, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee and deputy chairman of the Council of State; H. Kessler, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and GDR minister of national defense; G. Mittag, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee and deputy chairman of the GDR Council of State; O. Fischer, member of the SED Central Committee and GDR minister of foreign affairs;

From the Polish People's Republic -- W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, chairman of the Polish Council of State, and head of the delegation; Z. Messner, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers; J. Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; M. Orzechowski, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and Polish minister of foreign affairs; F. Siwicki, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and Polish minister of national defense;

From the Socialist Republic of Romania -- N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP, president of Romania, and head of the delegation; C. Dascalescu, member of the Political Executive Committee of the RCP Central Committee and prime minister of the Romanian Government; I. Stoian, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee and secretary of the RCP Central Committee; V. Milie, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee of the RCP Central Committee and Romanian minister of national defense; I. Totu, member of the RCP Central Committee and Romanian minister of foreign affairs; G. Caranfil, Romanian ambassador to the GDR;

From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics -- M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the delegation; A.A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs; S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of defense; V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee;

From the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic -- G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, president of Czechoslovakia, and head of the delegation; L. Strougal, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee and premier of the CSSR Government; V. Bilak, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee; M. Jakes, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee; B. Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and Czechoslovak minister of foreign affairs; M. Vachlavik, member of the CPCZ Central Committee and Czechoslovak minister of national defense.

Also taking part in the work of the conference are Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact States' Joint Armed Forces, and H. Krolkowski, general secretary of the Political Consultative Committee and GDR first deputy minister of foreign affairs.

The conference was opened by E. Honecker, who delivered a brief speech of welcome.

Three sessions were held which were chaired in turn by head of the USSR delegation M.S. Gorbachev, head of the CSSR delegation G. Husak, and head of the Bulgarian delegation T. Zhivkov. Speeches were made by Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, W. Jaruzelski, J. Kadar, N. Ceausescu, T. Zhivkov, G. Husak, and E. Honecker.

The Political Consultative Committee conference, which is taking place in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely businesslike cooperation, is examining the situation in Europe and the world as a whole, and in particular the issues of averting a nuclear war, moving on to specific nuclear disarmament measures, easing tension in Europe, and developing the all-European process, and the tasks of the struggle to restructure international relations on the basis of the assertion of the new political thinking which disclaims militarism and the cult of force.

The issues of stepping up further foreign policy cooperation within the Warsaw Pact framework and coordinating pressing joint foreign policy actions are also being discussed.

The Political Consultative Committee conference will continue its work tomorrow.

'Fresh Initiatives'

LD311626 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 31 May 87

[Text] Berlin May 31 TASS -- The meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states has reaffirmed that there is now every opportunity to carry out practical steps in the field of disarmament. A statement to this effect was made in Berlin by Willi Stoph, member of the Political Bureau of the SUPG Central Committee, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers.

Specific proposals, he said, have come from the Berlin meeting for a considerable cut in the forces and weapons of all types. The fresh initiatives of the Warsaw Treaty member-states are designed to serve towards building up confidence in relations between states, creating further prerequisites for disarmament. The results of the conference are a source of inspiration for all the forces of sanity and realism, give a broad scope for continuing the political dialogue with all who wish to contribute towards the cause of peace.

The Soviet Union's proposals that an agreement be concluded without delay on the elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe, and that Soviet and American theatre missiles in Europe be simultaneously eliminated open up a real chance to free the world from the nuclear weapons by the year 2000. In resolutely carrying out a peaceable policy, the GDR favours a full implementation of those proposals, Willi Stoph said.

Pact Doctrine 'Defensive'

LD291811 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 29 May 87

[Report by special correspondent Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The participants in the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting considered in detail the situation in Europe and throughout the world. They consider that the development of world events, the changes in international relations, and scientific and technological progress require new thinking and a new approach to the questions of war and peace.

The Warsaw Pact members again declare that their military doctrine is of a defensive character and proceeds from the need to maintain an equal balance of military forces at as low a level as possible. Those taking part in the meeting proposed that a number of practical steps should be implemented in the field of nuclear disarmament.

It is proposed that an agreement be concluded without delay on eliminating all U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. After the signing of such an agreement, the Soviet missiles deployed as retaliation for the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe will be withdrawn from the GDR and Czechoslovakia by agreement with the governments of those countries.

It is proposed at the same time that Soviet and U.S. operational and tactical missiles in Europe be eliminated and that talks be held on such missiles located in the eastern USSR and in the United States.

It is also necessary to resolve the issue of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. It is proposed that this be done at multilateral talks between the Warsaw Pact and the NATO member states.

The Warsaw Pact member countries also propose that agreement be reached on a radical reduction of strategic offensive armaments with a simultaneous strengthening of the conditions of the ABM Treaty. Specifically, it is proposed that over 5 years a 50 percent reduction be made in the strategic offensive armaments of the USSR and the United States and that then talks be held about subsequent reductions of them.

The Warsaw Pact organization proposes that efforts be made to achieve a total banning of nuclear tests.

The participants in the meeting resolutely advocate that the appearance of weapons in space not be permitted.

The ABM Treaty must be strictly observed.

The leaders of the allied socialist states advocated the drawing up of key clauses in an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States regarding strategic offensive armaments. These key clauses could, together with the signing of a treaty on medium-range missiles, be the object of an accord between the Soviet Union and the United States at summit level.

'New Political Thinking'

LD291401 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 29 May 87

[Text] First a dispatch from Berlin where a conference ended on Friday of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. As usual the conference brought together party and state leaders of the seven socialist member countries, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and the USSR.

The leaders of the seven Warsaw Treaty nations reviewed the situation in Europe and the world in the context of preventing nuclear war, getting down to real nuclear disarmament, developing the European process and restructuring international relations on the basis of new political thinking. What is this basis? It lies in negating militarism and the cult of violence on the international scene, in orienting toward cooperation and mutual assistance in the interconnected world of today. The point is humanity is facing a number of pressing problems which could be solved or at least dealt with jointly if it were possible to end the arms race. The problems are illiteracy and disease, environmental pollution, and tapping new sources of energy. In short disarmament and development.

This formula contains the only feasible and sensible approach to the global problems of our time. This is the only reasonable alternative to the race into oblivion, to nuclear disaster threatening the human race with the continued arms race and moreover with its extension to outer space. The socialist community has advanced a whole complex of concrete proposals to reduce military tension. The proposals cover strategic nuclear armaments, medium and shorter range missiles, chemical weapons, and conventional arms. The Warsaw Treaty countries have declared again and again that they are ready to reduce and even destroy any type of weapons along the principle of reciprocity, equality, and equal security of the sides.

Document, Communique Issued

LD291046 Moscow TASS in English 1040 GMT 29 May 87

[Text] Berlin May 29 TASS -- The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states ended its work here today.

The document "On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty Member States" was signed at the concluding session which was chaired by Janos Kadar, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' party.

The document was signed:

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria by Todor Zhivkov, for the Hungarian People's Republic by Janos Kadar, for the German Democratic Republic by Erich Honecker, for the Polish People's Republic by Wojciech Jaruzelski, for the Socialist Republic of Romania by Nicolae Ceausescu, for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by Mikhail Gorbachev and for the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic by Gustav Husak.

A communique of the meeting was also adopted.

The meeting passed in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation and demonstrated a unity of views on all questions under discussion.

Text of Communique

PM301925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 87, Second Edition pp 1, 2

["Communique on Conference of Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee"]

[Text] A meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance was held in Berlin on May 28-29, 1987.

From the People's Republic of Bulgaria the meeting was attended by Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party (BCP) and president of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria (PRB), head of the delegation, Georgiy Atanasov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PRB; Dobri Dzhurov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee and minister of national defense of the PRB; Milko Balev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee; Petur Mladenov, member of the Politburo of the BCP Central Committee and minister of the foreign affairs of the PRB.

From the Hungarian People's Republic the meeting was attended by Janos Kadar, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (MSZP), head of the delegation; Gyorgy Lazar, member of the Politburo of the MSZP Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the HPR; Matyas Szuros, secretary of the MSZP Central Committee; Petur Varkonyi, member of the MSZP Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of HPR; Ferenc Karpati, member of the MSZP Central Committee and minister of defense of the HPR.

From the German Democratic Republic the meeting was attended by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Central Committee, and chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic, head of the delegation; Willi Stoph, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers; Hermann Axen, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and secretary of the SED Central Committee; Egon Krenz, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and secretary of the SED Central Committee, vice-chairman of the State Council of the GDR; Heinz Kessler, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and minister of national defense of the GDR; Guenter Mittag, member of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee and secretary of the SED Central Committee, vice-chairman of the Council of State of the GDR; Oskar Fischer, member of the SED Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the GDR.

From the Polish People's Republic the meeting was attended by Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party (PZPR) and president of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic (PPR), head of the delegation; Zbigniew Messner, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PPR; Josef Czyrek, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee; Marian Orzechowski, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the PPR; Florian Siwicki, member of the Politburo of the PZPR Central Committee and minister of national defense of the PPR.

From the Socialist Republic of Romania the meeting was attended by Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania (SRR), head of the delegation; Constantin Dascalescu, member of the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP), prime minister of the Government of the SRR; Ion Stoian, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee, secretary of the Central Committee of the RCP; Vasile Milea, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the RCP and minister of national defense of the SRR; Ion Totu, alternate member of the Executive Political Committee of the Central Committee of the RCP and foreign minister of the SRR; Gheorghe Caranfil, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the SRR to the GDR.

From the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the meeting was attended by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, head of the delegation; Andrey Gromyko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet; Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister; Sergey Sokolov, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR defense minister; Vadim Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

From the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic the meeting was attended by Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, president of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, head of the delegation; Lubomir Strougal, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee, chairman of the Government of Czechoslovakia; Vasil Bilak, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee, secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee; Milos Jakes, member of the Presidium of the CPCZ Central Committee, secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee; Bohuslav Chnoupek, member of the CPCZ Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of Czechoslovakia; Milan Vlacik, member of the CPCZ Central Committee, minister of national defense of the Czechoslovakia.

Taking part in the work of the meeting were also Commander-in-Chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty Member States Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov and general secretary of the PCC [Political Consultative Committee], first deputy foreign minister of the German Democratic Republic Herbert Krolikowski.

1. The participants in the meeting studied in detail the situation in Europe and in the world as a whole. They believe that the development of world events, the changes in international relations, the growing inter-dependence of states, scientific and technological progress, the creation of weapons of unprecedented destructive power require a new thinking, a new approach to questions of war and peace, disarmament and other complex global and regional problems, a renunciation of the concept of "nuclear deterrence" according to which nuclear arms are a guarantee of the security of states. There can be no victors in a nuclear war.

They confirmed their conviction that the cardinal task is to avert war, rule it out forever from the life of mankind, preserve peace on earth, stop the arms race and move on to concrete measures of disarmament, first of all nuclear disarmament, directed at general and complete disarmament.

This requires the pooling of the efforts of all states, of all peace-loving forces, the strengthening of trust in relations between states, especially those belonging to different social systems, and their military-political alliances, a correct understanding of each other's concerns, aims and intentions in the military field.

The Warsaw Treaty member states again declare that their military doctrine is of a defensive nature, proceeds from the need to maintain a balance of military forces on the lowest possible level, the expediency of reducing military potentials to the limits of sufficiency necessary for defence. A document was adopted on this question at the meeting and will be published.

2. The participants in the meeting believe a possibility has now appeared for taking the following practical steps in the field of nuclear disarmament to stop mankind from sliding toward nuclear catastrophe:

-- To conclude without delay an agreement on eliminating all U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe on the basis of the principled accord reached in Reykjavik. Upon its signing and on agreement with the Government of the GDR and Czechoslovakia, Soviet missiles deployed in those countries as reply measures to the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Western Europe will be withdrawn.

-- To simultaneously eliminate Soviet and U.S. operational and tactical missiles in Europe and to hold talks on such missiles in the east of the Soviet Union and on United States territory.

-- To solve the question of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, including tactical missiles, at multilateral talks in the spirit of the Budapest initiative of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

-- To reach agreement on radical reduction of strategic offensive arms in conditions of a simultaneous strengthening of the regime of the ABM Treaty. The allied socialist states come out for a 50 percent reduction of the strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the United States in the course of 5 years and for talks on their subsequent reductions.

-- To press for a full prohibition of nuclear tests as a priority measure in stopping the development, production and perfection of nuclear weapons, their reduction and elimination. The Warsaw Treaty member states propose the undelayed opening of full-scale talks for the attainment of appropriate accords in this field.

The meeting's participants come out resolutely in favor of preventing the appearance of weapons in outer space, complying strictly with the ABM Treaty, reaching accords on banning antisatellite systems and "space-to-surface" weapons, preventing an arms race in outer space and using space exclusively for peaceful purposes on a rational basis, for the benefit of all of mankind.

The leaders of the allied socialist states advocated the elaboration of "key provisions" for agreements between the USSR and the United States with regard to strategic offensive weapons, the strengthening of the regime of the ABM Treaty and nuclear testing which, along with the conclusion of a treaty on medium-range missiles, could be a subject of a Soviet-U.S. accord at the highest level and a basis for drafting legally binding Soviet-U.S. agreements.

They deem it important that all European states, above all members of both alliances, actively facilitate the process of nuclear disarmament and ensure success of the relevant negotiations.

The Warsaw Treaty member states will do everything in their power to achieve specific accords on a bilateral and multilateral basis with a view to eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation before the turn of the century.

3. The states represented at the meeting favor the earliest elimination of chemical weapons.

They reaffirm their readiness to complete already this year the elaboration of an international convention on banning chemical weapons, destroying their existing stockpiles and the industrial facilities for their production. They recall their statement to this effect, adopted in Moscow on March 25, 1987.

4. Ways of implementing the program for reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe by 25 percent in the early 1990s, advanced by the Warsaw Treaty state in June 1986, were discussed.

Such reductions would be carried out simultaneously and together with tactical nuclear systems. Along with the implementation of the proposed reductions, the meeting's participants deem it necessary to work out new measures making it possible subsequently to turn to even more substantial cuts in the armed forces, armaments, and military spending through the year 2000.

The Warsaw Treaty member states view the process of reducing military confrontation in Europe as being continuous and ensuring equilibrium at the lowest possible level at each stage.

Taking into account the asymmetry in the armed forces of the two sides in Europe, determined by historical, geographic, and other factors, they express readiness to rectify in the course of reductions the inequality that has emerged in some elements by way of corresponding cuts on the side that is ahead. The process of reducing troops and armaments would be accompanied by a corresponding reduction in the states' military spending.

The states represented at the meeting call on all states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe to hold a meeting of foreign ministers, which would adopt a decision on starting large-scale talks with a view to reducing drastically the armed forces and conventional armaments and tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and reducing military spending accordingly.

It would be advisable that these talks also discuss a number of top-priority measures connected with the lowering of military confrontation and the prevention of the threat of sudden attack, reciprocal withdrawal of the most dangerous, offensive types of weapons from the zone of direct contact of the two military alliances, and the reduction of the concentration of the armed forces and armaments in the zone down to the lowest agreed upon level.

The second stage of the Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe would be the best forum for discussing these issues. At the same time there are other options for discussing disarmament issues, above all within the framework of the all-European process, including the convocation of a special forum.

The allied socialist states attach great importance to the informal consultations in Vienna between the representatives of the NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries, called upon to facilitate the elaboration of a mandate for the future negotiations.

In confirmation of their goodwill and in the interests of ensuring the best conditions for the future talks, the Warsaw Treaty member states express the readiness to display maximum restraint with regard to the development of their military potentials and, on the basis of reciprocity, not to build up armed forces and conventional armaments and to proclaim a moratorium for 1 or 2 years on the growth of military spending. They call on all NATO countries to display a similar approach.

5. The Warsaw Treaty member states attach great importance to steps on reducing military confrontation and strengthening security in individual parts of Europe and establishing zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons in the Balkans, in central and northern Europe. They reaffirm their determination to press for the implementation of the proposals on this issue, advanced by the GDR and Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Bulgaria.

As to the proposals of the GDR and Czechoslovakia for establishing a nuclear free corridor along the line of contact between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO 300 kilometers wide (150 km each side), all nuclear weapons could be withdrawn from it on a reciprocal basis: nuclear munitions, including nuclear mines; operational and tactical and tactical missiles, atomic artillery, nuclear-capable strike tactical aviation, and nuclear-capable anti-air missile complexes.

The Warsaw Treaty member states favor continuing and deepening the multilateral dialogue on establishing in the Balkans a zone free from nuclear and chemical weapons.

The states represented at the meeting fully back Poland's plan for arms reduction and confidence-building in Central Europe. Its implementation would be an important factor for strengthening peace and stability in the continent.

6. The implementation of disarmament measures would be guaranteed by an effective system of verification that would accord with the content of disarmament measures and include on-site inspection. Proceeding from the premise that in the event of transition to real disarmament verification becomes one of the most important means of ensuring security, the Warsaw Treaty member states support working out the strictest monitoring [proverka] measures at all stages of arms reduction.

Verification of the reduction of nuclear-missile armaments should be ensured everywhere -- at the site the missiles are dismantled and eliminated, at proving ranges and military bases, including in third countries, at training centers, storages and manufacturing plants, both state and private ones.

In the field of conventional armaments measures of verifying the very process of reduction would be accompanied by observation of the military activity of troops remaining after the reduction.

7. Having studied the course of the Vienna meeting of representatives of states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which has entered the responsible stage of working out generally acceptable accords, the states represented at the meeting declared their resolve to facilitate in every way its successful conclusion, the adoption at the meeting of substantive and balanced decisions facilitating real progress in the cause of disarmament, the strengthening of trust and development of relations between participating states in the political, economic and humanitarian fields on the firm and reliable basis of all the principles of the Helsinki Final Act. [paragraph continues]

They come out against the continent's division into opposing military blocs, for their simultaneous dissolution, for good-neighbourly cooperation in the common European home.

The states represented at the meeting express the conviction that the proposed meeting of ministers of foreign affairs of states taking part in the CSCE could not only facilitate the commencement of talks on the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe but also the solution of other questions of European security and cooperation.

All participants in the meeting agreed that lasting peace and good-neighbourly cooperation in Europe could be ensured only on condition of respect for the existing territorial-political realities on the continent. The activity of revanchist forces, first of all in the Federal Republic of Germany, and the encouragement of revanchism anywhere run counter to the interests of detente and security, the letter and spirit of the Helsinki Final Act. In the future, too, such activity will be most resolutely repulsed.

The interests of peace, of creating a climate of trust, mutual respect and friendship among peoples demand an end to the policy of hatred among them, to any attempts to implant anti-communism, preach racism, use any forms of discrimination, and to disseminate chauvinistic and nationalistic theses.

8. The Warsaw Treaty member states are prepared to search for ways leading to a further development of mutually advantageous economic and scientific-technical cooperation with all countries, come out for the removal of barriers in the field of trade and economic exchanges, for a deepening of economic ties among CSCE participant states because this would facilitate the strengthening of detente, security and peace in Europe.

The Warsaw Treaty member states come out for extensive interaction in the humanitarian field. They are convinced that everything should be done to ensure the rights of man to live and work in conditions of peace and freedom, and the full implementation of political, civic, economic, social and cultural rights in their sum total and interdependence in conditions of respect for the sovereignty of states.

9. The states represented at the meeting confirm their resolve to press for the formation of an all-embracing system of international peace and security that would encompass both the military and political and the economic and humanitarian fields. Interaction in the field of ecology would be its component part. Such a security system would lead to the creation of a nuclear-free world in which the use of force or the threat of force would be ruled out and relations between peoples would be conducted in the spirit of mutual respect, friendship and cooperation.

The socialist countries' initiative is directed at overcoming confrontational approaches, at asserting civilized standards, an atmosphere of publicity, openness [glasnosti, otkrytosti] and trust in international relations.

The participants in the meeting welcomed the extensive exchange of views on these matters that has begun in the United Nations Organization. They come out for continuing and developing an effective dialogue along all directions and at all levels to move on to concrete measures of forming material, political, legal, moral and psychological guarantees of peace, to a practical creation of security for all. They express hope that the 42d session of the UN General Assembly will make its important contribution to this. The United Nations Organization could become an effective guarantor of an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

The states represented at the meeting stressed the need for strict respect by all states for the principles of national independence and sovereignty, nonuse of force or threat of force, inviolability of borders and territorial integrity, peaceful resolution of disputes, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and other principles and goals of the UN Charter, the Helsinki Final Act and other universally recognized rules of international relations.

10. The leaders of the Warsaw Treaty member states exchanged views on areas of tension and conflicts in the world and reaffirmed their resolve to actively facilitate their fair political settlement by way of talks.

In the Middle East, holding an international conference under the UN auspices with the equitable participation of all sides concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine people, would be of great importance for attaining a comprehensive settlement and ensuring lasting peace in that region.

Establishing a preparatory committee with the participation of five permanent members of the UN Security Council and all sides concerned could be a practical step towards convening such a conference.

The earliest cessation of the Iraq-Iran conflict and the resolution of outstanding problems by way of talks with due account for the legitimate interests of both states on the basis of generally recognized rules of international law and order would meet the interests of international peace.

The participants in the meeting welcomed the creation of a nuclear weapons-free zone in the South Pacific, expressed the conviction that the interests of international security would be promoted by the consolidation of peace in the Korean Peninsula, resolution by political means, through talks, of all conflicts and problems existing in Southeast Asia, on the basis of respect for independence, sovereignty of every country, by the development of relations of good-neighbourliness and cooperation in the area. The participants in the meeting supported the course at achieving national reconciliation in Afghanistan, an early political settlement of the situation around it on the basis of ending any interference in the internal affairs of that country, respect for its independence and sovereignty. Interest was expressed in an early implementation of the Soviet-Afghan arrangement on the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan in the framework of a political settlement.

The states represented at the conference confirmed their solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of southern Africa against imperialism, colonialism, the racist apartheid policies, with the struggle of the Namibian people under SWAPO leadership for liberation and genuine independence. They resolutely condemned the aggressive actions of the Republic of South Africa against the peoples of Angola and Mozambique, of other neighboring independent states.

The participants in the conference proclaimed complete support for the efforts aimed at a fair political settlement in Central America, declared for an end to aggressive actions against Nicaragua, for the recognition of the right of each people to determine the roads of its political and economic development freely and without outside interference.

The participants in the meeting discussed some aspects of the economic situation in the world, including questions connected with overcoming underdevelopment and with the establishment of a new international economic order. A document was adopted on these questions. It will be published.

11. A thorough exchange of opinions on the development of cooperation among the allied socialist countries was held at the meeting. The work of the committee of foreign ministers and the committee of defense ministers over the period that had passed since the Budapest meeting of the PCC was positively assessed. Their future tasks were outlined.

When the questions of interaction in the framework of the Warsaw Treaty were discussed the participants in the meeting declared for imparting greater dynamism to cooperation in the foreign policy sphere, for further improving its mechanism, for the steady observance of the principles of equality and mutual responsibility in the system of political relations among the allied states. They attach importance to enhancing activity and initiative of every allied state in international affairs in the interest of conducting a concerted foreign policy course.

In this context it was decided to set up a multilateral current mutual information group consisting of representatives of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

It has been decided to create a special commission of Warsaw Treaty member states on questions of disarmament consisting of representatives of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Ministries of Defense to exchange views and information on questions of arms limitation and disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, including the discussion of initiatives of allied states and the working out of joint proposals in this field. The creation of the commission is called upon to facilitate a still more active participation of all Warsaw Treaty member states in joint efforts in the field of arms limitation and disarmament.

The Political Consultative Committee heard a report by the commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member states on the practical work done by the command and adopted a decision on this.

The meeting passed in an atmosphere of friendship and comradely cooperation. It demonstrated a unity of views on all questions under discussion.

The German Democratic Republic as the host country of the meeting will ensure the distribution of its documents among other states and international organisations.

The next meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty member states will be held in Warsaw. A representative of the Polish People's Republic, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs Henryk Jaroszek, was appointed secretary general of the Political Consultative Committee for the next term.

Document on Pact Military Doctrine

PM301921 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 87 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact Member States"]

[Text] The importance of correctly defining the aims and intentions of states and military-political alliances in the military sphere incorporated in their military doctrines increases in the present situation. Aware of this and proceeding from the need to rid humanity of wars, end the arms race, preclude the use of military force, consolidate peace and security and implement general and complete disarmament, the Warsaw Treaty member states decided to set out the fundamental provisions of their military doctrine which is at the basis of the activity of the Warsaw Treaty Organizations. The doctrine reflects the community of the defensive military-political aims of its member countries and their national military doctrines.

The military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty, just as of each of its member countries, is subjugated to the task of preventing war, both nuclear and conventional. Out of the very nature of the socialist social system these states have never linked and do not link their future to the military solution of international problems. They declare for a solution of all disputable international problems peacefully, by political means.

In the nuclear-space age, the world has become too fragile for war and power politics. Humanity is faced with the problem of survival in conditions when huge volumes of the deadliest armaments have been stockpiled. A world war, the more so nuclear war, would have catastrophic consequences not only for the countries directly involved in the conflict, but also for the very life on earth.

1.

The military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty member states is strictly a defensive one. It proceeds from the view that the use of military road for resolving any disputed question is intolerable in the present conditions. Its essence is that:

The Warsaw Treaty member states will never, under no circumstances, start hostilities against any country or an alliance of countries, unless they become the target of an armed attack themselves.

They will never be the first to use nuclear weapons.

They have no territorial claims to any state either in Europe or outside it.

They do not view any state, any people as their enemy. Quite the contrary, They are prepared to build relations with all countries without exception on the basis of mutually taking into account the interests of security and peaceful coexistence.

The Warsaw Treaty member states declare that they firmly base their international relations on the respect for the principles of independence and national sovereignty, nonuse of force or threat of force, inviolability of frontiers and territorial integrity, resolution of conflicts in a peaceful way, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and other principles and goals envisaged by the United Nations Charter and the Helsinki Final Act and generally recognized standards of international relations.

While favoring the implementation of disarmament measures, the Warsaw Treaty member states are compelled to maintain their armed forces in a composition and at a level that would allow them to repulse any attack from outside against any treaty member state.

The combat readiness of the armed forces of the allied states is maintained at a sufficient level so as not to be caught unaware. In the event of an attack, they will give a devastating rebuff to the aggressor.

The Warsaw Treaty member states never had, nor have an aspiration to possess armed forces and armaments in excess of what is necessary for these purposes. Thus, they strictly comply with the limits of sufficiency for defense, for rebutting possible aggression.

2.

The Warsaw Treaty member states regard ensuring reliable security of their peoples as their prime duty to them. The allied socialist states do not claim greater security than other countries, but they will not agree to lesser security either.

The existing military-strategic parity remains the decisive factor of preventing war. Further raising the level of parity does not yield, as experience shows, greater security. That is why they will continue applying efforts to maintain the balance of military force at an ever lower level.

Under these conditions, ending the arms race and carrying out measures of real disarmament are acquiring truly historic significance. The states nowadays have no other path but reaching accords on the drastic lowering of the level of military confrontation.

The Warsaw Treaty member states come out resolutely from these positions. In full compliance with the defensive essence of their military doctrine, they are consistently pressing for the following principal goals:

First. The earliest comprehensive ban on nuclear testing as a top-priority measure to end the development, production and perfection of nuclear arms, their stage-by-stage reduction and total elimination, prevention of the spread of the arms race into outer space.

Second. Prohibition and elimination of chemical and other types of weapons of mass annihilation.

Third. Reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe down to the level when neither side, in ensuring its defense, would have means for a sudden attack on the other side, for starting offensive operations in general.

Fourth. Strict verification of all disarmament measures, based on the combination of national technical means and international procedures, including the establishment of corresponding international bodies, exchange of military information and holding on-site inspections.

Fifth. The creation in various regions of Europe and in other parts of the world of zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons and also of zones of reduced concentration of armaments and increased trust, the implementation of military confidence-building measures in Europe on a mutual basis and the attainment of accords on such measures in other areas of the world and also on seas and oceans. The mutual renunciation by Warsaw Treaty member states and North Atlantic Treaty member states of the use of military force and the adoption of commitments to maintain relations of peace, the liquidation of military bases on the territory of other states; the withdrawal of troops within the confines of national borders, the mutual withdrawal of the most dangerous offensive types of armaments from the zone of direct contact of the two military alliances and also the lowering of the concentration in that zone of armed forces and armaments to the minimum agreed-upon level.

Sixth. Regarding Europe's continuing split into opposing military blocs as abnormal, the Warsaw Treaty member states support simultaneous dissolution of the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty and as the first step for the liquidation of their military organizations and ultimately for an all-embracing system of international security.

The Warsaw Treaty member states proposed to the North Atlantic Alliance member states to hold consultations with the aim of comparing the military doctrines of both alliances, analyzing their character and jointly studying the directions of their future evolution with a view to removing the mutual suspiciousness and mistrust that have accumulated for years, attaining a better understanding of each other's intentions and ensuring that the military concepts and doctrines of the military blocs and their members be based on defensive principles.

The existing imbalances and asymmetries in certain types of armaments and armed forces and the search for ways of removing them on the basis of reductions by the side that is ahead of the understanding that such reductions would lead to the establishment of ever lower levels could also be a subject of consultations.

The socialist member states of the treaty propose to hold such consultations at an authoritative expert level with the participation of military specialists of countries of both sides. They are prepared for holding such consultations already in 1987. The consultations could be held in Warsaw or Brussels, or in each of these cities alternately.

For the People's Republic of Bulgaria

Todor Zhivkov

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party,
Chairman of the State Council of the People's Republic of Bulgaria

For the Hungarian People's Republic

Janos Kadar

General Secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

For the German Democratic Republic

Erich Honecker

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany,
Chairman of the State Council of the German Democratic Republic

For the Polish People's Republic

Wojciech Jaruzelski

First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party,
Chairman of the State Council of the Polish People's Republic

For the Socialist Republic of Romania

Nicolae Ceausescu

General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party,
President of the Socialist Republic of Romania

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Mikhail Gorbachev

General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

For the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

Gustav Husak General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of
Czechoslovakia,
President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic

Berlin, May 29, 1987

Delegation Heads Meet

LD291443 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 29 May 87

[Text] A report from Berlin: Following the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states, a meeting of heads of delegations of the participant states took place. Attending the meeting were: Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of the Republic; MSZMP General Secretary Janos Kadar; Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council; Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council; Nicolae Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of Romania; Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of Czechoslovakia.

Honecker, Jaruzelski Dinner Speeches

PM031125 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "In An Atmosphere of Fraternal Friendship and Cordiality"]

[Text] Berlin, 29 May -- E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, gave a dinner today in honor of the participants in the Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Committee conference.

The following were present: the Bulgarian delegation headed by T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council; the Hungarian delegation headed by J. Kadar, general secretary of the MSZMP; the GDR delegation headed by E. Honecker; the Polish delegation headed by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council; the Romanian delegation headed by N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP and president of Romania; the USSR delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and the CSSR delegation headed by G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and president of the CSSR.

GDR party and state figures were also present.

E. Honecker addressed the gathering. Acting from a sense of responsibility for safeguarding peace, he said, we have conducted a broad and intensive exchange of opinions on the crucial questions of our time -- averting nuclear catastrophe and ensuring the basic conditions for the existence of all mankind. Our conference and its results give fresh impetus to the broad struggle to eliminate the threat of war and ensure a peaceful future. The indissoluble unity of socialism and peace has been convincingly demonstrated anew here. Thus the whole world public was again shown the humanist character of socialist policy, which was begun 70 years ago by the Great October Socialist Revolution's victory. It is a worthy contribution to the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution which we are celebrating this year as a common festival.

We attach main attention to eliminating medium-range missiles and all nuclear weapons, first and foremost in Europe, which is the common home of all Europeans, the GDR leader continued. The signing of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on the elimination of all medium-range missiles in Europe would be a first and important step toward freeing our continent of all the means of mass destruction.

Of course, those imperialist forces which dislike the thrust of all this have not abandoned their policy of confrontation, the arms race, and the pursuit of military superiority. We will continue to need our allied states' vigorous and constructive policy of peace, the growing might of socialism, and cooperation with all peace-loving forces to ensure that reason and realism ultimately prevail in international affairs.

Our most important goal is a non-nuclear world and peace in space. The Warsaw Pact states do not claim greater security for themselves than others have, but neither will they accept reduced security.

Our conference, E. Honecker stressed, has demonstrated the complete unity and cohesion of our alliance. Paths and directions toward the further deepening and improvement of cooperation among our parties and states in all spheres of social life have been outlined.

W. Jaruzelski spoke on behalf of the fraternal countries' delegations. The Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Conference was held in a spirit of responsibility for the peaceful future of Europe and the whole world, unity and cohesion, and mutual respect and trust, he said. The conference fully confirmed that the general political line of our parties and states is correct and that the coordination of their actions in the international arena is effective. We expressed once more our resolute will to strengthen the Warsaw Pact, our alliance, which guarantees our people's lasting security.

The present conference is a new step toward ensuring a durable and just peace, equal security for all states, constructive cooperation, and a fair regional and world economic order, W. Jaruzelski noted. Our peace initiatives are concrete, comprehensive, and open in character. They complement one another by linking national and regional priorities with the alliance's interests as a whole. The Soviet initiative on eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe is especially relevant and significant. An agreement on this question would be a real breakthrough in the process of ending the arms race and would open the way to lasting peace in Europe. That is also the aim of other initiatives put forward by the socialist countries.

The epoch-making historical transformations brought about in mankind's history by the Great October Revolution have had a fundamental influence on the destinies of hundreds of millions of people. Socialism has entered a period of great and fundamental changes which will determine its real place in the political, social, and economic life of the world on the eve of the new millennium. Our social system's vast spiritual forces and human and material reserves and our parties' reliable Leninist compass give us the confidence that socialism will meet the demands of history and will always be a symbol of peace, justice, and progress for all mankind.

The dinner took place in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and cordiality.

'Hope' for NATO Response

OW031125 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2245 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Yuriy Ulyanov commentary from the Novosti newscast]

[Text] GDR Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer, speaking at the plenary meeting of representatives of member states participating in the European Security and Cooperation Conference on 2 June, informed those present of the results of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting which took place in Berlin. Fischer emphasized that at the meeting in Berlin, the Warsaw Pact member states once again affirmed their determination to create a wide system of international peace and security. How will the West reply to the call from Berlin? This is the subject of our commentary.

[Ulyanov] Hello, comrades. The world continues to widely discuss the documents of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting which took place in Berlin last week.

So far, only the capitals of NATO member states have remained silent. We are not surprised by this -- little time has elapsed and it is dubious that the western countries will respond individually to the joint appeal of the seven European socialist countries. Especially, since (?the proposal for) the dissolution of NATO is not easy for the West to accept immediately. Mutual suspicion and distrust have taken years to accumulate.

But there are ways to eliminate this. For example, by holding consultations to compare military doctrines of both the unions. The Warsaw Pact countries make no secret of their military strategic concepts. In our plans there are no such concepts as the strategy of flexible response, the deterrent doctrine, and so forth, which proceed from the existence of hostile and opposing sides.

One of the main worthy aspects of the Warsaw Pact member states' military doctrine is that they do not regard a single state or people as their enemy. Only security is important to us, as it is to other countries.

A summit meeting of seven leading countries of the West will begin on 8 June in Venice. A NATO meeting at the foreign ministerial level is due to be held 11-12 June. Perhaps these meetings will give an answer to the call from Berlin. In any case, we hope so.

CPSU Politburo Discussion

PM051105 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 87 Second Edition p 1

["At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Excerpt] In the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee:

At the 4 June session, CPSU Central Committee Politburo discussed the results of the routine conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact member states which took place in Berlin 28-29 May. The Politburo endorsed the work of the Soviet delegation led by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The document on the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member countries, which clearly shows the defensive nature of the military strategy of socialism and is conducive to the development of a dialogue between the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO and to the strengthening of confidence in Europe, was highly appraised and supported. The unity of fraternal countries in their approach to international events and to the tasks they are to solve together was shown once again in Berlin. Having noted the positive changes in the atmosphere of international relations connected to a great degree with the initiatives of socialist states, the Politburo stated that the West is unjustifiably delaying its answer to these initiatives aimed at solving the problems about which the peoples of Europe are concerned, the need for the liquidation of medium-range and operational and tactical nuclear missiles in Europe and the limitation of the risk of a sudden attack occupying the first place among these problems. The importance of the measures drafted by the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee for improving the mechanism of foreign political cooperation, reciprocal information, consultation, and other forms of interaction between the Warsaw Pact member states was stressed. The accords attained during the conversation in Berlin between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Erich Honecker on 28 May were endorsed.

Pact Secretary Briefs Press

LD021639 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 2 Jun 87

[Text] Warsaw June 2 TASS -- The latest meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee was an important international event, the committee's new secretary-general, Polish Deputy Foreign Minister Henryk Joroszek told a press conference here today.

Its results reaffirmed the socialist community's peaceful activity. The documents adopted at the meeting concentrated attention on key problems of the time: prevention of war, security, implementation of definite disarmament measures and development of equitable international cooperation.

The course towards detente, disarmament and confidence-building was further developed and specified at the Political Consultative Committee's meeting, Jaroszek said.

Honecker Cited

PM051735 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 87 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Erich Honecker Statement"]

[Text] Berlin, 2 Jun -- The Warsaw Pact states' Political Consultative Conference in Berlin gave a powerful new impetus to the consolidation of peace and disarmament. The proposals put forward there demonstrate their initiators' desire to rid mankind of wars forever. This has been stated here by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council.

The Political Consultative Committee Conference in Berlin, he said, was devoted primarily to solving the most important task of the present day -- saving the world from the threat of nuclear catastrophe. In our tense time politics is the means whereby joint actions can be used to safeguard peaceful coexistence. Our aim, the GDR leader stressed, is a planet free of nuclear weapons and peace in space. Thus we fully support the initiatives put forward by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The first real opportunity has now appeared to actually achieve a disarmament accord. The GDR advocates the absolutely unconditional elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe, which will make it possible to embark on nuclear disarmament as well as disarmament in the conventional arms sphere on the basis of the principle of equality and identical security. This opportunity must be used to achieve a breakthrough. This would be a considerable gain for all who are striving for a stable and durable peace. This is all the more important in view of the fact that nowhere in the world is there such a vast quantity of armed forces and armaments -- including nuclear munitions -- concentrated as in Central Europe.

The reduction of military confrontation is served by the series of initiatives the GDR and the CSSR have put to the FRG Government. The implementation of those proposals, E. Honecker said, will open the way to significant moves toward a nuclear-free Europe and a nuclear-free world.

Husak Cited

PM020801 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the general heading "International Public Comments on Results of Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference": "A World Without Weapons; Important Accords Reached; Statement by Gustav Husak"]

[Text] Prague, 30 May -- G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR president, has stated in an interview with Czechoslovak journalists disseminated by the CTK news agency that the adoption of the document "On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact States" was an important result of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference in Berlin. It clearly follows from this that the socialist countries' military doctrine is peaceful and purely defensive in nature.

The Warsaw Pact states are striving to maintain military equilibrium at the lowest level. Our aim is to ensure that the NATO countries adopt a similar principle instead of their essentially aggressive doctrine, the CSSR leader stressed.

He noted that the documents of the Political Consultative Committee's Berlin conference specifically discuss ways to develop the disarmament process, limit military potentials, and gradually embark on the path leading to a world without weapons, above all nuclear weapons.

G. Husak pointed to the great importance of the unity of opinions reached at the Political Consultative Committee conference on international problems and on questions of mutual cooperation.

Together with military and foreign policy questions, he said, the discussion of economic problems was no less important. All socialist countries are striving to accelerate socioeconomic development and enhance the role of scientific and technical progress. Each country is doing this as far as its capacity and requirements permit. Important agreements were reached at the Berlin conference on specific steps to deepen mutual cooperation and on the need to restructure the CEMA's activity. The fact that each side approached the accords in its own way but with an eye to the common aim of boosting the socialist community's influence and achieving the great goals facing it is satisfying, the CSSR leader noted.

USSR Foreign Ministry Press Briefing

LD011646 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Jun 87

[Text] A briefing was held today at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center in Moscow for Soviet and foreign journalists, on the results of the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the member states of the Warsaw Pact. Speaking at the briefing was Vadim Petrovich Loginov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs. In examining the documents adopted at the conference, he said, inter alia:

[Begin Loginov recording] A document on the military doctrine of the member states of the Warsaw Pact was adopted at the conference.

It says clearly their military doctrine is of a strictly defensive nature, and is based on the need to maintain a balance of military forces at the lowest level possible and on the expediency of reducing potentials to levels sufficient for defense. What has given rise to the appearance of this document?

Greater significance is currently acquired by a correct understanding of the aims and intentions of states and of military-political alliances in the military sphere, as embodied in their military doctrines. In the nuclear and space age the world has become too fragile for war and for policies of force. In conditions when colossal quantities of the most lethal weapons have accumulated, mankind has found itself faced with the problem of survival. A world war, still more a nuclear war, would have catastrophic consequences, not only for the countries directly involved in the conflict, but also for life itself on earth.

Realizing this and proceeding from the need for the final removal of war from the life of mankind, a halt to the arms race, the ruling out of the use of military force, the strengthening of peace and security, and the implementation of complete and universal disarmament, the Warsaw Pact states thus decided to set forth the fundamental tenets of their military doctrine, which forms the basis of the activities of the Warsaw Pact and reflects the common nature of the defense and military and political goals of its member states and their national military doctrines.

The Warsaw Pact's military doctrine, like the military doctrines of each of its participants, so this important document states, is subordinate to the task of averting both nuclear and conventional war. By virtue of the very nature of the socialist social structure, these states have not linked and do not link their future with a military resolution of international problems. They advocate that all disputed international issues be resolved only peaceably, through political means.

The crux of the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine is as follows: The Warsaw Pact's member states will never, in any circumstances, begin military action against any state or alliance of states whatsoever, if they themselves are not the object of an armed attack. They will never use nuclear weapons first. They are not making territorial claims toward any state either in Europe or beyond Europe. They do not regard any state or any people as their enemy. On the contrary, they are prepared to build relations with all countries in the world without exception, on the basis of mutual consideration of security interests and peaceful coexistence. [end recording]

Deputy Foreign Minister Comments

LD011314 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 1 Jun 87

[Text] A deputy foreign minister of the Soviet Union Vadim Loginov has stated that the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty countries in Berlin has shown clearly their desire to make progress in the field of disarmament. Vadim Loginov told a Radio Moscow correspondent that the Warsaw Treaty countries propose to the NATO countries holding talks on the most complicated issues about the military doctrines of the two alliances and measures that should be taken to build up confidence. The public in the NATO countries has taken notice of those proposals and it can be said that the first reaction to them was on the whole positive. We are not disappointed, he added, by the fact that there has still been no official reaction on the part of NATO. We expect the governments of the NATO countries to study the proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries and give well-weighed, constructive answer. [sentence as heard]

Gromyko To CSSR Envoy

PM041841 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "CSSR Ambassador Presents Credentials"]

[Text] A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received Jindrich Rehorek, Czechoslovak ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, in the Kremlin 3 June for the presentation of credentials. The ambassador was accompanied by embassy diplomatic staff.

Speaking at the ceremony, the new Czechoslovak ambassador said that he considers it a great honor to be representing Czechoslovakia in the world's first socialist country.

The recent visit to Czechoslovakia of M.S. Gorbachev turned into a mighty demonstration of friendship between the two peoples and of unity and cohesion between the CPSU and the CPCZ. This visit marked a landmark which will determine the development of our bilateral cooperation for many years to come.

The indestructible friendship of the peoples of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union is deeply rooted in history. It is sealed forever with the blood of their best sons and daughters who gave their lives in the struggle for our freedom.

Today we are creating and building a new society. This can be done only in conditions of peace. Therefore the struggle for peace and the prevention of nuclear war is the paramount and most sacred task of socialism.

Addressing the Czechoslovak ambassador, A.A. Gromyko said:

In accepting your credentials which accredit you as the CSSR's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, I cordially greet you on behalf of our country's Supreme Soviet Presidium as the official representative of a fraternal socialist state, Czechoslovakia, to whom we are linked by indestructible bonds of friendship and fruitful cooperation.

I thank you for conveying the warm words and good wishes addressed to the Soviet leadership and our entire people by Gustav Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee and CSSR president, and the government of fraternal Czechoslovakia.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent visit to the CSSR was a vivid and emphatic demonstration of the friendship between our countries. We were all glued to our television sets when we saw what a welcome he was given in your country. All this is quite natural and we are pleased with the results of this visit.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership I would like to tell you that we will continue to conduct the same policy of fraternal friendship and close cooperation toward your country.

Now a few words about the relations between our countries as members of the Warsaw Pact Organization. The session of the Political Consultative Committee which has just ended in Berlin was yet another demonstration of the unity of these countries both in questions of foreign policy in general, and in questions of European security in

particular. A communique and an exceptionally important document on the military doctrine of Warsaw Pact member states, a doctrine which is strictly defensive in character, have been adopted.

We are restructuring the leadership of the economy and social life. We are trying to fully exploit the potential inherent in our socialist system. And we believe, I will go further and say we are confident, that we will be successful.

We will see how the situation pertaining to the Soviet proposals on questions of the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons will develop further. These proposals are on the U.S. Administration's table. People in Washington are saying that they are studying our proposals actively and specifically. They have been doing so for too long.

It cannot be said for certain today that all that needs to be done is to open the door and that an agreement is right there. A definitive official answer on questions on which agreement is necessary has still not been received from the U.S. side.

In conclusion I would like to say that you will find full support and understanding on our side for your efforts aimed at further deepening Soviet-Czechoslovak relations.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership I convey to you best wishes for success in your responsible mission.

Everything that has been said applies in equal measure also to the staff of the Czechoslovak Embassy.

I wish you success in your important and responsible work.

After the presentation of credentials, a warm and friendly conversation took place between A.A. Gromyko and Jindrich Rehorek in which T.N. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and V.P. Loginov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, took part.

Shevardnadze Sees Spanish Ambassador

LD061414 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 6 Jun 87

[Text] Moscow June 6 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR foreign minister, received today Spain's ambassador to the USSR Jose Cuenca at the latter's request.

The ambassador conveyed a message from the chairman of the Spanish Government to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Both sides noted the importance of the Soviet-Spanish political dialogue, which is being extended, and its contribution to improving international situation, removing the danger of a nuclear war, strengthening trust between the East and the West.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that initiatives and ideas set forth at the Berlin meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states were a new contribution to the struggle for achieving these goals.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1520

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTARIES RESPONDING TO WARSAW PACT MEETING

'International Observers Roundtable' 31 May

LD311820 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT, 31 May 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the Institute of the USA and Canada, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin, political observer; and Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades. An event of the first importance this week has been the conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. That conference has given a new boost to the struggle of the socialist countries, allied countries, to strengthen peace. It has shown that the Warsaw Pact member states are directing all their work in foreign affairs toward creating in Europe -- it is, naturally, of Europe that one is primarily speaking -- a stable and reliable peace.

The conference examined the international situation as a whole. It examined the initiatives -- peace initiatives -- that the socialist countries have been expounding recently -- namely, the peace initiatives of the Soviet Union, the proposals of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia, the plan recently put forward by Jaruzelski, and other proposals. You know that all the socialist countries are now making an active contribution to the policy of peace; and at the conference of the Political Consultative Committee those proposals were once again interpreted, accumulated and conjugated, so that they have now become the common proposals of the socialist states.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, I should like to draw to the attention of our listeners the political background of the work of the Political Consultative Committee. That conference has been held at what is indeed a most crucial, and, in some senses, decisive moment in the development of international politics, not only in this current year, but also for the years ahead. This is because, in effect, it is what happens now that will determine whether we shall succeed, in 1987, in drawing up the first major Soviet-American agreement to eliminate a whole class of armaments, or whether we shall have to wait many more years for that decision. I think that the comrades who are listening to us are aware that a fierce political battle is now going on both in Western Europe and in the United States over this problem of whether or not there is to be a USSR-U.S. agreement on medium-range missiles and possibly on other classes of armaments. Of course there is also a struggle in progress over the question of whether or not there is to be a new USSR-U.S. summit meeting -- a fruitful,

full-scale meeting, a meeting that will achieve major results. In this situation, the work of the Political Consultative Committee is not only a confirmation of the clear political choice of the Soviet Union and of our country's partners, allies and friends, but also a definite development of the initiatives that have been a feature of socialist foreign policy throughout these recent years. I think the documents -- which comrades will no doubt already have had a chance to glance at -- the communique and the very interesting document on the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states -- all these documents are truly on a large international scale and of great international resonance. Though I will anticipate and say at once that attitudes to them in the world, depending upon the political orientation of the various mass media, do not present a uniform picture. Those media and those politicians who are in the habit of dismissing such things as propaganda and claim there's nothing new in these documents -- whereas surely the point about Berlin is precisely this, that there is an enormous amount that's new. [sentence as heard] But you have to be able to read, analyze what you've read, and draw conclusions from it.

[Levin] All the same, Nikolay Vladimirovich, I'd like to add that even before the Political Consultative Committee conference opened, the predominant view in many organs of the Western press was that much could be expected of this conference. Western Europe has now, to some extent, become used to our dynamic foreign policy and has realized that this would be no routine conference -- that it would be putting forward new initiatives.

[Shishlin] I wouldn't say they've become used to it, I'd say they have become spoiled. Western Europe considers that every speech by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and every decision of the Warsaw Pact is sure to contain some sensation. But I think the hallmark of our current foreign policy is that it is, indeed, a dynamic, developing policy which is seeking solutions, seeking reasonable compromises. That quest is undertaken jointly with the socialist countries. Here, of course, the voice of each socialist country is precious.

[Zhurkin] Of course. Well, I think there is perhaps no need for us to recount the contents of the documents of the conference of the Political Consultative Committee, but some things are worth mentioning. Above all, what's new is, for instance, that this is the first time the leaders of the Warsaw Pact countries have adopted a document on military doctrine -- the first time in just over 30 years of its existence. That does not mean that the member countries of the Warsaw Pact had no doctrines -- they had them. You can say that the Warsaw Pact did have a common doctrine. But, all the same, this common doctrine had never before been formulated in so precise and, I would say, so modern and so realistic a spirit: In a spirit corresponding to the realities of our age. After all, the doctrine of any state is something that evolves and develops. If we think back, say to the postwar period, then in the first years we -- and not we alone -- thought nuclear war very probable, and in certain conditions, I suppose, it could even have been considered inevitable.

Then somewhere around the mid-fifties, decisions of the very greatest importance were made. A firm decision was made that both by virtue of the changed social situation in the world and as a result of the colossal destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons, nuclear war was not inevitable -- that there was a possibility of averting it. That was a conclusion of enormous political significance. Then the Soviet Union achieved military-strategic parity with the United States, and the Warsaw Pact, the forces of the Warsaw Pact, achieved parity with those of NATO -- achieved a certain equality of forces with the NATO countries.

Of course it has been said more than once that interpretation of the international situation, political thought, not infrequently lags behind reality. No doubt there has been a lag of this kind in this interpretation of the problems of international security and of military-strategic problems over, say, the last 10 or 15 years. We are now seeing how rapidly -- literally in the space of a year or two -- this interpretation has been catching up with the reality of the situation. A number of new and very modern concepts have been introduced: Of adequacy of armed forces, for instance; or the clear realization that parity is not a panacea, not a guarantee, but that, as the arms race develops, disruptions are possible that would mean that parity will not be a full, 100 percent guarantee against the drift towards nuclear war -- well, and a great many other things besides.

[Shishlin] Vitaliy Vladimirovich, what you have just mentioned is indeed very important. It is contained in the doctrine -- the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states: This point about the adequacy principle.

[Zhurkin] You know, Nikolay Vladimirovich, the interesting thing is that less than 1 year has passed since the time of the Budapest documents of the Political Consultative Committee, which we have more than once analyzed and which, indeed, did have something new to contribute to the development of an approach to the problems of international security. Now we have the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee. Less than 1 year has passed and yet many things that were merely charted in the Budapest documents have today been fully formulated. In particular, the theses you are talking about on the armed forces structure, for instance, or the need to reduce, first of all, in the process of arms reduction those elements that impart an especially offensive character to that armed forces structure and that create the conditions in which a sudden attack could occur. This, I believe, is one more confirmation of the dynamism, of how fast thought is moving, and how rapidly more and more new decisions are coming into effect. Yet, unfortunately, when we look at the NATO side we see that there things are moving very, very slowly. Frankly, the West has still not given any proper reply to the Budapest proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries. Though at the NATO session in Brussels last December in a very slick and vague form...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Yes, really it's only in Vienna that they -- at that meeting -- and even then, they're only thinking of the framework of the talks, the membership and subject matter of the talks, even though in Budapest at that time there were perfectly practical and specific ideas on the table. These have now been made still more specific, and in general the hope would be, of course, that the NATO countries, too, would bestir themselves, and that to this challenge that has been thrown down -- and this is undoubtedly a political challenge, a challenge offered by one system to the countries of the other system -- that to this challenge they would somehow try to respond worthily, worthily in the sense that this would, after all, strengthen security in Europe.

[Levin] The issue could hardly be made any clearer. We are proposing a meeting of the foreign ministers of the states that took part in the general European conference to determine the subject matter of negotiations on the reduction of armaments, including conventional armaments, and armed forces in Europe. We consider that one possible option would be to hold that conference of foreign ministers within the framework of the second stage of the meeting on strengthening trust in Europe or at some other forum. Now let me say in passing that we are offering similar alternatives in connection with several of the proposals put forward in Berlin. Let us say it is proposed to hold consultations with the aim of collating the military doctrines of the two alliances: Then we say: Certainly, let us hold these consultations in either Warsaw or Brussels, or alternately, if you like, first in one, then in the other.

Another element of these consultations is that their purpose is not just to examine together the direction of the evolution of the military alliances. Rather, the idea is to remove the mutual suspicion and distrust that have been building up for years and to achieve a better understanding of each other's intentions. In other words, it is now very often the lack of trust that we are discussing. Indeed, where trust is concerned, the situation is far from ideal. Here we have yet another very concrete and very businesslike proposal. It may not appear sensational at first sight. It is not a conference or a meeting of the foreign ministers of the 35 states, but, nonetheless, it is a very important element on the practical level, and an exceedingly important element on the political level, as well. Furthermore, when we say: Yes, there is, by virtue of the development of military doctrines, by virtue of geographical, historical, and various other conditions, a certain asymmetry in the development of the various types and armed forces; of fundamental importance is our position, which is that we propose reducing those asymmetries at the expense of whoever has gotten ahead. Let us say that everyone knows that the Warsaw Pact Organization has more tanks, while NATO has more antitank weapons.

[Zhurkin] You know, Nikolay Vladimirovich, the interesting thing is that less than 1 year has passed since the time of the Budapest documents of the Political Consultative Committee, which we have more than once analyzed and which, indeed, did have something new to contribute to the development of an approach to the problems of international security. Now we have the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee. Less than 1 year has passed and yet many things that were merely charted in the Budapest documents have today been fully formulated. In particular, the theses you are talking about on the armed forces structure, for instance, or the need to reduce, first of all, in the process of arms reduction those elements that impart an especially offensive character to that armed forces structure and that create the conditions in which a sudden attack could occur. This, I believe, is one more confirmation of the dynamism, of how fast thought is moving, and how rapidly more and more new decisions are coming into effect. Yet, unfortunately, when we look at the NATO side we see that there things are moving very, very slowly. Frankly, the West has still not given any proper reply to the Budapest proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries. Though at the NATO session in Brussels last December in a very slick and vague form...

[Shishlin, interrupting] Yes, really it's only in Vienna that they -- at that meeting -- and even then, they're only thinking of the framework of the talks, the membership and subject matter of the talks, even though in Budapest at that time there were perfectly practical and specific ideas on the table. These have now been made still more specific, and in general the hope would be, of course, that the NATO countries, too, would bestir themselves, and that to this challenge that has been thrown down -- and this is undoubtedly a political challenge, a challenge offered by one system to the countries of the other system -- that to this challenge they would somehow try to respond worthily, worthily in the sense that this would, after all, strengthen security in Europe.

[Levin] The issue could hardly be made any clearer. We are proposing a meeting of the foreign ministers of the states that took part in the general European conference to determine the subject matter of negotiations on the reduction of armaments, including conventional armaments, and armed forces in Europe. We consider that one possible option would be to hold that conference of foreign ministers within the framework of the second stage of the meeting on strengthening trust in Europe or at some other forum. Now let me say in passing that we are offering similar alternatives in

connection with several of the proposals put forward in Berlin. Let us say it is proposed to hold consultations with the aim of collating the military doctrines of the two alliances: Then we say: Certainly, let us hold these consultations in either Warsaw or Brussels, or alternately, if you like, first in one, then in the other.

Another element of these consultations is that their purpose is not just to examine together the direction of the evolution of the military alliances. Rather, the idea is to remove the mutual suspicion and distrust that have been building up for years and to achieve a better understanding of each other's intentions. In other words, it is now very often the lack of trust that we are discussing. Indeed, where trust is concerned, the situation is far from ideal. Here we have yet another very concrete and very businesslike proposal. It may not appear sensational at first sight. It is not a conference or a meeting of the foreign ministers of the 35 states, but, nonetheless, it is a very important element on the practical level, and an exceedingly important element on the political level, as well. Furthermore, when we say: Yes, there is, by virtue of the development of military doctrines, by virtue of geographical, historical, and various other conditions, a certain asymmetry in the development of the various types and armed forces; of fundamental importance is our position, which is that we propose reducing those asymmetries at the expense of whoever has gotten ahead. Let us say that everyone knows that the Warsaw Pact Organization has more tanks, while NATO has more antitank weapons.

Very well, let us reduce the number of tanks to the level that NATO has, and the number of antitank weapons to the level that the Warsaw Pact countries have. Or take tactical air forces: NATO has an appreciable preponderance. Here, too, we can and must go for reductions, not increases. This is not just an abstract concept; as we have already noted, the main issue now, in today's world, is the question of eliminating medium-range missiles. At the same time, we also are talking about the second zero option: operational and tactical missiles, but very often in the West you can hear talk that since the West has fallen behind in operational and tactical missiles, it would be desirable -- and some even say preferable -- for NATO to increase its number of operational and tactical missiles to be level with the Soviet Union. However, what we propose is to reduce everything in such a way that parity is at the lowest possible level. This is also a very important, fundamentally important, thesis.

[Zhurkin] Of course. Then we could go on to lower that parity, which would be at the lowest possible level, even more. That is the philosophy of the approach of the Warsaw Pact member states.

[Shishlin] We can say that, as such, the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee conference, as far as the military aspect of the activities of the Warsaw Pact is concerned, represent in some degree a deepening, a concretization, and a decoding of the fundamental programmatic ideas that were enshrined in the well-known Soviet statement of 15 January 1986. I am speaking of the program for the stage-by-stage elimination of nuclear weapons and of that absolutely vital and necessary movement toward a nuclear-free world, outside of which -- outside of that movement, of course -- the future of mankind must remain cloudy.

[Levin] Of course, Nikolay Vladimirovich, this also is really a challenge to the West. There is, indeed, a perfectly clear line to be drawn between those who stand for nuclear disarmament, for the total abolition of nuclear weapons, and those who want somehow or other, on some scale or other and on whatever basis, to retain nuclear

weapons, in other words, to retain the weapons the use of which could lead to the destruction of the human race. That simple boundary is being drawn quite clearly today between those who are for human survival, who want the human race to continue, and those who, by whatever motives they use to justify it, want to preserve these weapons that could put an end to human history altogether. Well, Warsaw Pact member states have stated their position quite clearly and unambiguously.

[Zhurkin] A significant feature of the decision of the Political Consultative Committee is the wide audience to which they are addressed. Yes, it's true in a general sense that the Warsaw Pact is a European military-political organization; and of course the arena in which the Warsaw Pact operates is, above all, the continent of Europe. The countries of the Warsaw Pact have no thought of extending its activities to any other zones of the world. But in this interconnected world, which is brittle and forms, in some measures, an integrated whole, of course the countries of the Warsaw Pact do not shut their eyes to the problems that exist in modern international relations. It seems to me valuable that Berlin has advocated the exclusive use of political means in overcoming regional conflicts. The considerations contained in the communique of the Political Consultative Committee regarding ways of overcoming regional conflicts -- notably such acute ones as the conflict in the Near East, the situation of the Afghan problem, and the situation in Central America -- all this certainly represents a definite political platform of consolidating national relations in the most dramatic manner, of course.

[Levin] Vitaliy Vladimirovich, you were talking about the process which is now taking place, of those realities the world encounters.

However, the common denominator of this interpretation is exactly the new thinking that dictates ways of solving problems, which the Soviet Union is putting forward. Thus, all the documents of the Berlin Political Consultative Committee, under careful scrutiny, are clearly channelled along the line of this new political thinking: they reflect this new political thinking and show how we envisage it in practice. However, when we speak about our Western partners in negotiations, here we are forced to ascertain that they are, as yet, clearly lacking this new political thinking. At the same time, even if there were some partial breakthroughs, we hope that there will be success... [changes thought] I think that today we can speak with a large degree of hopefulness about the fact that an agreement on the liquidation of medium-range missiles in Europe is possible, even if this were to happen, this -- I am talking about Western politics -- still does not, so far, reflect any sort of new approach toward the very essence of the problem. We, on the other hand, are proposing that all the negotiations on the reductions of armaments and armed forces, nuclear and conventional, be conducted precisely in line with this new political thinking. Our concept is clear from here: to lead the whole task toward minimal armaments, toward the minimal amount of armed forces, and this issue is probably one of principle.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, you started talking about new political thinking. However, you yourself, of course, as well as Vitaliy Vladimirovich, and I myself, often encounter the question, what is the new political thinking, our often interlocutors ask. What are the elements of this new political thinking? Thus, the first element, the first element of this new political thinking is to see the world as it is -- in other words, contradictory, but interdependent, in a certain measure integral -- this element, I think is beginning to make headway. Despite all ideological prejudices, of which there are simply mountains in the West, it is making headway. The new political thinking, of course, demands actions commensurate to those challenges which the end of

the 20th century is posing to mankind. Mankind simply must begin to see that it is threatened with extinction not only from the accumulation of armaments, from a sort of failure in politics, or failure on the part of some individual, but that it is also threatened with enormous dangers due to the growing gap between the developed North and the poverty-stricken South. Here terrible dangers are also hidden. I think that it is precisely in this sense that the decisions of the Political Consultative Committee place this problem of overcoming backwardness very distinctly next to the problem of the reduction of the arms race, the overcoming of military confrontation. Therefore, the new political thinking is not --- and it is most important to understand this --- some sort of political abstraction: The new political thinking is an absolutely practical answer to those real problems which the contemporary world today encounters. The decisions of the Political Consultative Committee have, of course, been sustained in this spirit.

[Levin] I completely agree with you Nikolay Vladimirovich. For example, let us compare the position and actions of our partners today, with what used to happen only 2 or 3 years ago. Are there any big, fundamental changes? Objectively we must admit that there are not. We must not look at the world through rose-colored glasses. However, at the same time, let me draw your attention to the fact that in certain areas where the West used to try to lead an offensive, today, politically, it remains on the defensive; in certain areas some quite influential political forces are admitting the practicability of Soviet proposals and Soviet initiatives. Maybe today these forces have not, as yet, put enough pressure on their governments and have not forced them to adopt many sensible proposals; there are, nevertheless, attempts to maneuver, and not just to push ahead boldly as used to happen some 2, 3, or 4 years ago. I think that a period of some 1, 2, or 2 and 1/2 years in a historical sense is, on the whole, not long, but during this period a certain relaxation and in some instances even a certain erosion of tough, intransigent positions of various forces in the West has taken place.

Or what has happened is that forces which spoke out rigidly and actively from positions of confrontation are now becoming more and more compromised, and forces which take a more constructive approach to contemporary international relations --- maybe in theory they do not yet acknowledge the new thinking --- however, these forces in their countries now appear as the most realistic forces, as the more serious forces. I would like to say once again that often it is a question of nuances; however, in such important ... [changes thought] when we talk about such important political categories, nuances also play a significant role. Nevertheless, there is really movement in the world. There is movement, and, once thinks, in a more constructive direction.

[Shishlin] It is not that we have directly set ourselves the task of changing the world in 1 day; of course our policy has been gathering energy, dynamism and courage; in general what has happened is that, of course, our foreign policy has been significantly enriched, but also international relations have been enriched by having been drawn into the process of restructuring. It is the initial phase, and the distance stretching in front of us is great, but the decisions of the recent Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin --- this is another step on the way to this restructuring of international relations.

[Levin] It is precisely in connection with this, I think, that we should note another detail. We appeal to all the states of the European Continent, to all the participant states of the All-European Conference, to make their own contribution toward solving the problem of the reduction and the limitation of armaments. Europe is our common home and we must solve these problems jointly. We appeal to all the forces who take the position of reason. Concern for the destinies of the world, not only in Europe but in the whole world, pervades all the documents of the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee, and, therefore, the general tone of this conference, the documents adopted there, I think with good reason can be characterized as optimistic, constructive, businesslike. There are a lot of concrete proposals. We are putting forward a wide platform -- now it is up to the West. This program comes to an end here, comrades. Thank you for your attention. All the best.

Vremya 31 May

LD312222 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; "Telebridge" report under the rubric: "Studio 20," presented by S. Alekseyev. Participating are Moscow television correspondents Yevgeniy Shirokov, in Budapest; Aleksandr Zholkver, in Berlin; Vladimir Kondratyev, in the FRG; and Vsevolod Shishkovskiy, in the UK -- live or recorded]

[Excerpts] "Hello, comrades! This week has turned out to be particularly generous with major, substantial events in international life. The main ones, indisputably, were the official friendly visit to Romania by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and the regular conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the participant states of the Warsaw Pact in Berlin. How do our neighbors on the planet assess their results? How do they match them with the policies of their countries and with their current period? I have asked some of our foreign correspondents to talk to us today". [passage omitted]

[Alekseyev] "Precisely on the day Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev completed his visit to Romania and on the eve of the opening of the conference in Berlin, meetings of the leading bodies of NATO ended in Brussels. In the course of these meetings, as is well known, the military men and politicians of NATO again stated their adherence to the doctrine of military deterrence, an offensive doctrine, and the doctrine of flexible response. They also agreed on new increases in their military budgets and on an increase in the quantity of conventional weapons in Europe, in other words, on the complete opposite of what the participant states of the Warsaw Pact were calling for in Berlin. As is well known, the tone at the Brussels meetings was set, together with the United States, by the Federal Republic of Germany. Has its position changed now? A question for our correspondent in the FRG, Vladimir Kondratyev:

[Kondratyev] The position of the West German military and politicians cannot be examined in isolation from the situation currently taking shape in the FRG on the issue of eliminating medium- and short-range missiles. By all accounts, the Federal Government this week will give its formal agreement to the double-zero solution, which it has so long and stubbornly opposed. Many on the Rhine are unable to conceal their irritation on account of the outcome, unfavorable to them, of the missile discussion. Another propaganda campaign is beginning. Activists in the CDU-CSU are discovering new windows of vulnerability in the event of the implementation of the zero-option, this time in conventional weapons. They juggle with the figures, and it turns out that the overall superiority is 3-1 in favor of the East, and countermeasures have to be taken. They attribute the capacity for invasion to the Soviet Union.

[Alekseyev, interrupting] And this -- sorry -- is while the countries of the Warsaw Pact are offering to begin consultations on our military doctrines and on the allegedly existing imbalance in conventional types of weapons?

[Kondratyev] Yes, at precisely this time the FRG is harping on so-called deterrence. The total liberation of our continent from nuclear weapons is, in general, a nightmare for Bonn. Here they simply cannot renounce the postulate according to which the maintenance of peace in Europe is impossible without the combination of both nuclear and conventional weapons.

[Alekseyev] Well, is there, at least, some concrete reaction from Bonn officialdom to the results of the conference in Berlin?

[Kondratyev] There is a reaction. I would call it positively restrained. On the one hand Bonn would like to confirm her interest in a political dialogue with the Soviet Union. At the same time, voices can be heard that the Warsaw Pact has not offered anything new. They themselves do not put forward any concrete ideas, but act according to the principle: Why hurry? Why rush? Let us wait; perhaps we will be offered something else.

[Alekseyev] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave the apt name: a game of cat and mouse to such attitudes on the part of the NATO countries to the proposal of the Warsaw Pact member states on nuclear disarmament and consolidating peace and security in Europe. To what extent do they share this thought in Britain? Question for Vsevolod Shishkovskiy:

[Shishkovskiy] I have to say there still remain unclear patches in the policies of London, too. Officially, the British Government has stated that it supports the double-zero option, which provides for the elimination of medium-range and operational and tactical missiles in Europe. However, this statement was bound up with a whole series of provisos, that the elimination of these types of nuclear weapons must not lead to a weakening of the security of the West or to a renunciation of the notorious NATO strategy of flexible response. There can be no doubt that the results of the Berlin meeting which have stimulated great interest here in Great Britain and will exert a certain influence on the course of the pre-election campaign in Great Britain. At the same time, this course is showing the reluctance of Thatcher's party to renounce old stereotypes. This was confirmed by the discussion on issues of defense, which has gotten under way literally in the last few days. The Conservatives have made a direct attack on the policy of a non-nuclear Britain proclaimed in the Labour manifesto.

[Alekseyev] While our telebridge has been going on today, a report has been brought to me in the studio from the teletype, which, I think, can sum up our meeting today. A correspondent of the British news agency REUTER writes: Now, after Berlin, the West has so many concrete proposals from the Soviet Union and the socialist countries that it is simply impossible, simply shameful, not to give a reasonable reply to them. It is really difficult to add anything to this. All the best.

IZVESTIYA Editorial

PM041421 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Doctrine of Political Realism"]

[Text] A conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee was held in the GDR capital recently. It approved documents that are important for the cause of peace. The defense alliance of the socialist states announced its military doctrine for the first time.

...It is our lot to live in a complex world full of contradictions and terrible paradoxes.

Surely it is terrible that an intellect which has absorbed the very latest scientific and technological achievements, which has found thousands of ways to ease and enrich human life both materially and spiritually, and which is mastering the art of prolonging this life, should at the same time devise fantastic possibilities to destroy every living being? The same brilliant discovery of our age -- nuclear energy -- is capable of healing and destruction, creation and devastation, and can be the source of either light and warmth or a world conflagration and the destruction of all mankind.

Surely it is terrible that our planet, which has served as a stronghold for the human race for thousands of years, should become in just a few decades something fragile and catastrophically vulnerable -- both in our minds and in reality? Surely it goes against common sense that those who fear the removal of missiles from Europe are reassured by the fact that they will still have at their disposal 4,600 nuclear charges, each of which is a potential Hiroshima? It is monstrous. It goes against all logic. It remains a fact, however, and the dangerous reality of our time.

Awareness of the dangers of the nuclear-space age cancels out the old, established ideas of war and peace and the usual criteria of diplomacy and military dealings. The time demands new approaches, measures, and evaluations. It demands new thinking in politics.

To admit that the further accumulation and even the simple preservation of nuclear weapons not only does not guarantee security or increase it but, on the contrary, undermines it, is a sign the new political thinking is getting through. To set one's hopes on more sophisticated, more powerful types of weapons and some space "shield" or "umbrella" serving as protection in a nuclear war means you are still in thrall of illusions which pose a threat to peace.

To understand that in a nuclear conflict there would be neither victor nor vanquished, only fellow sufferers, means you are filled with a sense of responsibility for present and future generations. To strive for nuclear superiority and place one's hopes in carrying out a first strike with impunity means you are consciously gambling with the life of human civilization.

To move step by step along the path of disarmament means you are repeatedly raising man's chances of survival. To delay with disarmament means reducing these chances to unpredictability, which could develop into catastrophe.

The nuclear age does not tolerate unpredictability. It has marked clear watersheds and has faced mankind with a choice: either a nuclear-free world or the threat of nuclear death.

In the 70 years since the victory of the Great October Revolution, socialism has constantly reaffirmed the peaceable nature of its aims and aspirations. This desire for peace has once again been confirmed in the whole series of peace initiatives offered at the Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin and in the Warsaw Pact Military Doctrine expounded at this conference.

This document, unprecedented in the history of international relations and consequently in the history of military-political alliances, gives an integrated concept of peace which must have no place for policies based on a position of strength. The Warsaw Pact military doctrine, like the military doctrine of each of its individual members, is geared to the task of preventing war, both nuclear and conventional. We proceed from the fact that in the present conditions the use of military means to resolve any dispute is inadmissible. We need armed forces and arms for the sole purpose of defending ourselves in the event of an attack. We need nothing more than this. We do not regard any state or any nation as our enemy. Our main aim is to end the arms race and achieve real disarmament.

It is natural that the uncommon nature of the new initiatives has been remarked throughout the world, particularly the proposal to hold consultations between Warsaw Pact and NATO representatives for the purpose of comparing military doctrines and removing the mutual suspicion and mistrust which have built up over the years. At the same time, we cannot help but be alarmed by the fact that some NATO capitals have immediately tried to dismiss the matter, saying "There is nothing new in this. We are also in favor of peace."

It is true there is no lack of peacemaking rhetoric in the West. Its flood increases whenever legislators are asked to cough up the money for another arms program. Every dollar in the NATO military budget tends to be presented as...concern for universal peace. But actions weigh more than words on the political scales.

NATO is every ready to underline the "dovish" disposition of its own bloc and accuse the Warsaw Pact of "aggressive intentions." But will it ever take the decision to publicly make a mutual pledge not to be the first to begin military operations? Not to be the first to use nuclear weapons? To ratify these pledges, following the example of the socialist states, with the signatures of its countries' top leaders to give its words the force and effectiveness of an international legal document? Proposals on this score have been made repeatedly to the North Atlantic bloc but we have never received a constructive response.

Those in the capitals of the NATO states spare no effort to prove by arithmetical computation that the Warsaw Pact is ahead on conventional weapons. For some reason they remain silent on the proposal which has been repeated many times over and was once again reaffirmed in Berlin: To avoid these futile, prolonged mathematical disputes, each side should reduce its surplus. A positive reaction to this initiative could also be a specific action in favor of peace.

Finally, so such was once said in the West in defense of the "zero option," but when this same zero option reappeared in the form of our initiative and demanded action -- there was a hitch. Not for the first time NATO is taking time to coordinate its position and dragging its heels before giving its final answer. Again words instead of action.

We are guided by realism in diplomacy and defense issues. As long as others have missiles pointed at us we cannot give up our own. Equilibrium and parity have been and remain the main factor in military-strategic stability.

The prevailing tension in the world and our own historical experience compel us to maintain our defense capability. However, we are in favor of parity at an increasingly low level and a radical reduction in arms, primarily nuclear. We are in favor of making this process ongoing and irreversible. It could begin right now with the elimination of medium-range missiles and operational and tactical missiles in Europe and end with the complete destruction of nuclear arsenals by the end of the century.

Since the Soviet Union first put forward its program for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons, the number of missiles in the world has not diminished -- this has still to be achieved. However, for the first time a ray of light has pierced the veil of fear created by the nuclear danger which has enveloped our planet for the last 4 decades. This ray of light must grow and become the window on a nuclear-free future.

Moscow TV Commentary

LD032151 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 87

[Report by Tomas Kolesnichenko identified by caption as "editor of the PRAVDA International Department;" from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The political and public circles of various countries continue to comment on the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact member states. [video shows Tomas Kolesnichenko speaking to camera]

[Kolesnichenko] Good day, comrades. The military experts and the politicians do indeed now have something to study. After all, realistic proposals were put forward in Berlin, proposals which are directed toward the most important goal: saving the world from a nuclear catastrophe. What is more, these proposals have been coming from the Soviet Union and also from other participants in the Warsaw Pact. In particular, for instance, the proposal of the GDR and the CSSR paves the way to a nuclear-free Europe. The chief thing is that the joint document adopted in Berlin on the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine is indeed a direct challenge to NATO to seek the principles of an equal balance of forces at the lowest possible level needed to ensure defense.

If the North Atlantic bloc were to agree to this, you can imagine how far and how much faster the cause of disarmament would advance. However, the first reaction from official spokesmen of the NATO Headquarters in Brussels do not as yet cause one to be particularly optimistic. For instance, the NATO spokesmen have welcomed the idea of talks on conventional armaments but are not actually agreeing, or at least have not yet agreed, to the Warsaw Pact proposal that joint consultations be held on military strategy.

How can this be understood? Well, it is evident the NATO leaders, who have constantly been trying to convince us and the whole world that their alliance is purely defensive, now when it has become a matter of concrete deeds, have either lost their heads or are indeed not ready to give practical evidence on NATO's defensive character. The well-known U.S. journalist Flora Lewis forthrightly points out that NATO's hesitating on this issue because it is unable to draw up a concerted plan on how to set about the lowering of the levels of armaments.

The reaction of NATO's uppercrust to the proposal that there be a mutual reduction in arms expenditures and that a moratorium be imposed on expenditures for 1-2 years can also be appraised in this way. Although there has been no official response, the newspapers, citing Western diplomatic sources, are saying NATO regards this proposal as propaganda, it is claimed.

Perhaps it might be better to check this in practice. After all, you see what happens when both sides display an interest. It is precisely on this account that, to judge by everything, the realistic and even to hear that the prospect has appeared for reducing nuclear missile weaponry in Europe. If the defensive character of military doctrines gains the upper hand, the world will certainly become far more secure. It is precisely for this that the participants in the Berlin meeting are calling.

'Studio 9' 4 June

OWO40843 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0605 GMT 4 Jun 87

["Studio 9" program presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio; with Albert Ivanovich Vlasov, first deputy chief of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee and doctor of historical sciences; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY; and Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. The Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact countries, which ended its session at the end of last week, is an event of such seriousness and of such outstanding significance in international life that in our opinion it is necessary to devote a special "Studio 9" program to it.

A document on the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states was adopted in Berlin. A military doctrine is a document which determines the military policies and the concepts of a state, or a group of states, for a prolonged period. It is not a declaration aimed at affecting foreign countries or for propaganda purposes, but a statement of a concept by which the states are governed in their practical actions -- in this case, in the military sphere.

For a discussion of the events that took place, we have invited to "Studio 9" experts from the Soviet delegation who took part in the work of the Berlin session of the Political Consultative Committee: Albert Ivanovich Vlasov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department and doctor of historical sciences; Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chairman of the board of NOVOSTI; and Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

It should be said that in the days following the adoption of the military doctrine, document, different currents became apparent in Western propaganda when commenting on this most important event.

On the one hand, the more serious organs of the press, the most serious observers, speak of the great importance of the event, about its long-range significance, and about the serious conclusions that must be drawn. But there are also those who beat the drum in the old way and who attempt to depict the event as little more than Soviet and Warsaw Pact propaganda.

Albert Ivanovich, what do you say about this?

[Vlasov] It should be noted that in general, the majority of foreign journalists understand the importance of the document which was adopted in Berlin -- the interrelation, I would say, of the communique on the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact member states and the Warsaw Pact members' military doctrine document. There is an understanding that these two documents combine mutual recognition and the growing interdependence of states in the contemporary world which demands new thinking and a new approach to the questions of war and peace, disarmament, the need to free oneself from the standard old approaches and notions of the international situation.

At the same time, of course, we should not discount those organs of the press which, following bad traditions, when they do not have convincing counterarguments, attribute initiatives of the Soviet Union and fraternal socialist countries, and even statements in favor of disarmament from their own public -- congressmen, parliamentarians, political parties -- to the realm of propaganda. This action thus infuses the very word propaganda with a negative connotation. We have seen this on many occasions, and it has become, and I emphasize this, a bad tradition of the opponents of disarmament.

Among the statements made and the appraisals given, which become more numerous in Western mass media with each passing day -- in the press, reputable journals, radio, and television -- there appears to be either a direct or indirect acknowledgement that it would not be correct to use old stereotypes to appraise the events of the world and the movement to a nuclear free world. This is very important. Because, you will remember, in both the document and in the communique there is a special point on this in which this tendency is reflected and which predicts a year in advance how the propaganda line in the West will develop in relation to the adopted documents. Without it, it is impossible to create a climate of trust, mutual respect, friendship, and cooperation. In other words, we must renounce the stereotype of enemy and move on to the stereotype of a partner. I mean the positive connotation of the word stereotype.

Because as social practice has shown, all attempts to spread anticommunist stereotypes simply contradict, I would say, civilized human relations in politics, and in all foreign relations matters.

[Zorin] Albert Ivanovich spoke about the reaction throughout the world. Valentin Mikhaylovich, I would like to ask you the following question: The sessions take place regularly. What is the qualitative value of the Berlin session, what did it bring, and why is it now causing such a widespread reaction throughout the world?

[Falin] Apparently a number of reasons are involved. First, because of the very critical moment at which the session took place. In the following weeks and months it should be decided whether it will be possible to stop the arms race. Will it be possible to slow down the rush of mankind toward the brink of the abyss or even extinction? If yes, then on what basis? If no, then what threatens all of the peoples? Not only the people of the United States and the Soviet Union, whose governments are undertaking the main talks, but all peoples, no matter where they are? I am not exaggerating. It is to some extent even a matter of political chronology. Americans themselves are paying attention to the question that should agreement not be reached by the end of this year, or at the very worst, at the beginning of next year, then the present administration will not be able to see the agreement through Congress.

[Zorin] Next year it will be paralyzed by the election campaign?

[Falin] Yes. It will be completely paralyzed by the election campaign and then internal reasons will push aside all concepts of sensible reasoning and totally different rules will enter into play.

For this reason alone there is a need to reach a determination. The second reason the Berlin session has such importance is that it took place after Reykjavik. Reykjavik was not simply a meeting. It was not even a meeting of the highest leaders of the USSR and the United States at a working level. It was a landmark in world development.

Third, and this, too, should be kept in mind to evaluate the significance of what was achieved in Berlin. This is actually stated in the text of the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states. What does the document begin with? In today's situation the significance of the correct understanding of the goals and intentions of states and military political alliances in the military sphere embodied in their military doctrines is growing. In order to end various speculations about the Soviet military threat, about the hostile intentions of the Soviet Union and its friends, the goals of the socialist countries have been stated very clearly in the document -- the short-, medium-, and long-range steps that they are prepared to undertake to ensure that these goals do not remain just that but become a reality. Also, the determination of the states to continue to adhere to the course of refusing to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the refusal to reach military superiority, and a readiness to limit the level of their Armed Forces to one sufficient for effective defense.

There are a number of other additional elements which, in my opinion, are particularly important because they have been loudly voiced precisely at this point. This is the demand which is expressed in the communique. A demand that the process of lowering the level of military confrontation -- that is the process of disarmament -- should be continuous, so that the states are insured against that which they encountered yesterday and the day before; namely, the agreement is reached. It acts for a very short time, if it comes in force in the first place. We already know of several examples when the Americans did not ratify the treaties they signed. This is then followed by another round of the arms race, only because someone imagined that the previous agreements were bad, or because science and technology created new types of arms. If policies depend on military technology, then it should be said the world is in for a difficult time.

[Vlasov] There will be endless instability.

[Falin] Yes. Endless confrontation and instability will be the destiny of states and peoples.

[Zorin] Valentin Mikhaylovich, I wish to continue my question and ask you: What is new about the doctrine that was adopted in Berlin and how does it differ from previous one?

[Falin] You see, there has been so much speculation in the West about the previous doctrines that these speculations formed whole libraries. Basing their judgments on separate statements by individual military people -- marshals or sometimes colonels -- they attributed to us anything which the West found profitable to attribute.

[Primakov] These attributions were most often taken out of context.

[Falin] Well, this is the usual method we must get used to. By the way, they are not dropping this method now. In particular, there were assertions that the Soviet Union supposedly counts on victory in a nuclear war. Moreover, this thesis is used in the United States from time to time at the highest levels even now. They know perfectly well that this is a falsehood, but, nevertheless, find it necessary to continue it. About 30 years ago a book entitled "Military Strategy" and edited by Marshal Sokolovskiy was published in the USSR. I just want to remind you that Foy Kohler, the U.S. ambassador in the 1960's, after reading this book, recommended that the U.S. Government for the first time introduce an embargo on the export of pipes to the USSR. He based his judgment on an indication in the book of the important significance of pipelines for the strategic infrastructure of states. However, one can indeed interpret in this fashion literally anything, not to find the truth, but in order to justify one's own military doctrines which are incompatible with the interests of secure peace.

If we speak of significantly new features reflected today in the military doctrine document, I would list the following first: This is the first integral document to unify the aims and intentions, and the stage-by-stage methods to reach these aims and intentions in different spheres; to propose an instrument for coordinating the positions of the West and the East; and, at the same time, suggests the ways states can efficiently control the subjects of their agreement. In other words, the document answers all basic questions discussed for decades not only by experts, but also by the public.

[Primakov] Valentin Mikhaylovich, I would like to draw your attention to the following question: Many principles that you mentioned and are in the communique have already been stated. They are now linked with the military doctrine, and a military doctrine is a document of a special nature. It is used as a basis for practical military construction and preparations, and is being embodied in practical deeds. This is why I think that it is a qualitatively new feature.

[Zorin] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you pushed me toward a difficult question, which I would like to ask you. Valentin Mikhaylovich used the term sensible sufficiency [razumnaya dostatochnost]. How do you think this sensible sufficiency can be combined with the necessary military balance?

[Primakov] First, I would like to talk about sensible sufficiency. We first formulated the question in this way around the time of our party's 27th congress. It was a question of the possibility of sensible sufficiency. The issue is having sufficient means for reliable defense to guarantee reliable security of the country. Sufficient means, no more. By the way, I think this deprives those who want to tire us out economically in the arms race of many possibilities. Unfortunately, or perhaps not, for a long time we followed the United States in almost mirror-image fashion perhaps necessary at that stage. We played the game, with the United States making the rules, and we were catching up with them in many areas of the arms race. That is now being stopped by securing sufficiency of defense. That our party is dealing very seriously with both the protection of sovereignty, and reliable fighting efficiency, and so forth, is proved by the Politburo session, which resolved many questions in a resolute and timely way. Now, however, I would like to answer your question about the correlation between these concepts.

This is a very important question indeed because there are those who reason in the following manner: If there is sufficiency, what is parity for? Sufficiency, they say, can be guaranteed without any parity. This is an incorrect way to put the question. I shall present several arguments in the dialectics of interaction, which I think have some significance. First, military strategic parity is imperative, as long as nuclear exist. At the same time, the political means to guarantee security take precedence at this stage, while parity exists. Second, the parity level should be lowered. This must be the main trend. Third, I think the qualitative assessment of parity comes to the fore in the condition of the principle of sufficiency, while the quantitative assessment still retains importance. The qualitative assessment lies in the fact that the inability of each side to avoid a reciprocal strike, which would cause unacceptable damage, becomes apparent. I am sorry, I am using the Western term, when I say unacceptable damage. They calculate the unacceptable damage as 60-percent destruction of industry and 30-percent loss of population. I think it is blasphemous to dwell on this matter. From my point of view, a 1-percent loss of population is already unacceptable.

However, let us use Western terminology on this occasion. The meaning of parity lies in the following: After delivering a first strike to the other side, neither side can avoid a reciprocal destructive strike.

There is, however, another point -- after the elimination of nuclear arms, and it is very important to emphasize it right now, deterrence should be implemented by international political and judicial means, by raising the role of the United Nations, the IAEA, and the space control organization and so forth, while military means should be based on sensible sufficiency for repulsing an attack. This formulation of the issue attests to the correlation of these concepts.

[Falin] Allow me to add another aspect. I suggest we look at the military doctrine document. It states: Reduction of armed forces and conventional arms in Europe should go down to the level at which no side, while securing its defense, would have any means whatsoever for a sudden attack on the other side or for undertaking any offensive operation.

[Primakov] This is a very valuable addition.

[Falin] In other words, the matter lies in the idea that states would have no material prerequisites for conducting an aggressive policy....

[Primakov, Vlasov, interrupting together] Nor the means.

[Falin] Nor the means, even if some undesirable events occur inside a country and -- this is not excluded -- a group with rather adventurist views on relations comes into power; it would not be able to realize these concepts in aggressive acts toward other countries and peoples.

[Primakov] Absolutely correct.

[Zorin] It is clear. Now, Albert Ivanovich, I would like to ask you the following question. Naturally, every Warsaw Pact country has its own military doctrine. What is the correlation of the united doctrine of the Warsaw Pact countries adopted in Berlin with the other doctrines of the member countries.

[Vlasov] I think this question has a certain sense. Every fraternal country has grown economically. They have formed political institutions, and accumulated their own economic and political experience. You will probably agree that every socialist country is able to develop independently. They can do it, naturally not on their own, but by constructing mutual relations with other fraternal countries based on internationalism. The dialectics of mutual relations of socialist countries at the current stage of their development consist simply of this fact. If we approach the document we are now discussing from this point of view, I think that we will see that this military doctrine has an international character, if I may put it this way. It reflects common aspirations and common wishes of fraternal socialist countries.

[Zorin] I want to continue the discussion and my question, and ask you to reply to the following question: The document has been adopted in Berlin and is being widely discussed. Nonetheless, it is simply an adopted document. What can and should follow to transfer all of this to a language of facts and specific actions? After all, a document is only a document.

[Blasov] I think we can find the answer in events that preceded Berlin. I have in mind Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Prague and Bucharest. The CPSU general secretary and the leaders of the fraternal countries made statements raising very important and interesting problems concerning both our bilateral relations and general problems of the socialist community and the situation in the world, in particular in Europe.

What should follow the adoption of these documents is an understanding of the current indisputable reality — the inadmissibility of using military means for solving disputed international questions. This is probably the most important, and I think it is one of the elements of the new political thinking. Recognition of this reality by the West demands truly practical actions. After all, in the post-Reykjavik period, the West essentially has been given a second opportunity to decide a very important issue, namely' the elimination of medium-range missiles.

If this opportunity is missed it is difficult to forecast how the world will develop further. Obviously, it will develop in terms of an increasing arms race and instability.

It has already been said here, and I would like to draw our television viewers' attention to this once more, to those new points my colleagues spoke of when discussing the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member countries. It is not only filled with the dynamics of goals, tasks, and means, but also with new proposals. The Western press, as a matter of fact, focuses particular attention on the military doctrine's orientation and its ties with the solution, not only to questions of nuclear disarmament, but also limitation of conventional arms and reduction of armed forces in Europe. They propose a mechanism for resolving this issue, both the correlation of the two doctrines, their comparison, and the question of a balance of arms and armed forces.

The main thing is — and this is particularly emphasized there in the doctrine — that questions of imbalances and asymmetries that have formed in separate kinds of arms of the armed forces should also be an object of consultations. This includes a search for ways to eliminate the imbalances on the basis of reducing them where there is a preponderance, with the understanding that these reductions will lead to the establishment of increasingly lower levels. This is a very important point.

In other words, I would like to reiterate that in my opinion these specific actions by the West will be a verification, another verification, of their genuine desire for disarmament and peace, as they have recently often proclaimed. I think there have been sufficiently numerous statements about this from presidents, ministers, prime ministers, and so forth. In other words, we are waiting for specific steps by the West.

[Primakov] Now, comrades, let us imagine a purely hypothetical situation. Of course we hope that it will not be hypothetical, but let us talk about a hypothetical situation for now. The Warsaw Pact states have adopted a military doctrine. They have stipulated their attitude toward everything, toward practically all military questions. This will be translated into military planning and military construction. This is assured on our part, I am sure of this matter because we will not deviate from this. We will orient the training of our Warsaw Pact armies not toward initiating a nuclear war, of course, but toward restraining the military danger and ensuring reliable defense, not toward beginning any military activities, and so forth.

Take the West. NATO will sit down with us at the negotiating table and it will put its doctrine on this table. It will compare it with our doctrine and will also make it defensive. Many opportunities will appear for resolving specific issues, on reducing armed forces, and, naturally, conventional arms and conventional armed forces in Europe.

At the same time, this doctrine also proposes measures of confidence, verification, and inspection -- the entire package of measures that can ensure stability.

Now if everything falls into place in this way, then, it seems to me, you will find a positive answer to your question in terms of the possibility that this doctrine can really be implemented. Unfortunately, we cannot expect the West to come to the negotiating table so easily, to adopt identical measures to those that we are proposing.

I am very wary now of the real picture concerning the talks that are being conducted with us. On the one hand, everything is being done to show that the United States is approaching the possibility of earnestly reaching an agreement on medium-range missiles, while, on the other hand, more and more new arguments against these agreements are being presented. Besides, it is not just the United States that is doing this. Certain European countries are playing up to it, and are possibly even becoming more Catholic than the Pope on this issue.

[Zorin] Now, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, in connection with what you have said, I would like to ask Valentin Mikhaylovich a question. Let us assume that Yevgeniy Maksimovich expressed a certain amount of optimism. Let us assume...

[Primakov interrupting] A balanced optimism.

[Zorin] Very well, a balanced optimism. Well, let us hope that agreement on medium-range missiles will be achieved as well as on operational and tactical missiles. But what are the chances -- not to mention guarantees -- that there will be progress, that agreements will be reached on strategic missiles, on the entire package that is being discussed in Geneva?

[Falin] Unfortunately, there are no such guarantees at present and it does not appear that they will eventuate soon. I would like to draw attention to the fact that the perception of the other side, at the present moment, regarding military construction and regarding military doctrines still does not in any way resemble or in any way indicate readiness for a new thinking. These doctrines are rooted in past perceptions, and the impression I get personally is that, at the official level, both Washington and a number of European countries are most unhappy with our most recent proposals.

Things would be easier for them, it would be easier for them to conduct their affairs, if there were no such proposals.

[Vlasov] You remember the reaction of Western journalists at the news conference to the response, your response, on the question of the Americans urging us not to raise the issue of reducing operational and tactical missiles?

[Falin] Yes, the talks held by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev with Secretary of State Shultz in Moscow confirm this. To the Soviet proposal to eliminate operational and tactical missiles with a range of over 500 km, the U.S. secretary of state responded by urging the Soviet leader not to do this but to adopt a completely different decision, to permit the United States to increase the number of these missiles in West Europe.

Mikhail Sergeyevich had to spend a fairly long time to show the absurdity of this approach. Why increase the number of U.S. missiles if the Soviet Union is reducing its missiles of this type to zero? The only thing the secretary of state agreed to do was to inform the President and his allies, insofar as he had no instructions, to say yes to this reasonable proposal.

But I wish to draw your attention to the following. I think there are grounds today for reminding you that at this stage the U.S. doctrine as such is not only vague in many instances, but is continuing in its main features the line that essentially gave rise to all of the ills, alarms, and concerns of the post-war period.

I quote the words of a very high-ranking U.S. military man, Admiral James Watkins, U.S. chief of naval operations. Speaking not just anywhere, but to the Senate Armed Services Committee, the admiral stated: We are talking about defense strategy. But this is a national position. We consider aggressive defense characterized by placing the forces at the frontlines and close to the enemy and the aggressiveness of our ships to be the best deterrent.

I would like to ask the admiral his views if such a deterrent were practiced by the Soviet Union and its allies.

[Zorin] Clearly the admiral would not like it.

[Falin] He would not like it. But my attention is drawn to the following situation: that this is taking place today. The United States, or at least its authoritative representatives who determine the action and concepts in utilizing its Armed Forces, generally adopt positions that were formulated as far back as 1949-50. Consequently, when we compare our doctrines with the Western countries, we will have to look closely at the fine print [raskryt skobki] -- at what deterrent and defense mean -- so that the U.S. national defense posture does not turn out to be a preparation for an aggressive war.

I understand, as does everyone else, that agreement on medium-range missiles, on operational and tactical missiles with a range of over 500 km can be seen as only a stage, as a first step to other agreements on strategic missiles, to nonproliferation of weapons into space, the destruction of chemical arms, a deep reduction in conventional arms. To eliminate only some of the weapons while retaining others and, moreover, as NATO member countries now demand, to compensate the reduction of these arms by expanding the arms race in other spheres, is not the path which our side will adopt nor will agree to.

[Primakov] Nevertheless, Valentin Mikhaylovich, let us achieve agreement on medium-range missiles. It will be a tremendous impulse in the solutions to other questions, because for the first time in history an agreement will be signed on real reduction, and even physical destruction of the most contemporary means of waging war -- not the ones which became obsolete and are being replaced with new ones, but the most contemporary means of waging war. For the first time, verification may be implemented and both sides will be assured of the effectiveness of the agreement.

[Zorin, interrupting] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, I think you have convinced Valentin Mikhaylovich and that is why I wish to ask you another question. Obviously, when the documents were being adopted in Berlin, the primary aspects considered were Soviet-U.S. relations and problems, and the relations between the Warsaw Pact member countries and NATO, but apparently we must not distance ourselves from events in other areas of the world, the so-called regional conflicts. All of this is closely related and therefore my question to you is: What is the position of the Warsaw Pact military doctrine on so-called regional conflicts?

[Primakov] I, too, will give you a broad picture of the situation, or at least attempt to do so. First, the main thing now is the possibility of an agreement with the Americans. According to different estimates, together we have between 93-97 percent of nuclear missile means, and agreement to their reduction remains the most important element.

The conflicts are also extraordinarily important, because they could act as detonators which could blow up the world. There are active conflicts that are engulfed in flames, for example, the Persian Gulf -- the United States is building up its military presence. Iran and Iraq are waging an endless war. This war is creating conditions for greater and greater interference by the United States.

[Falin, interrupting] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, how can the conflict in the Persian Gulf be eliminated if the U.S. President as recently as 30 May declared that one of the aims of his policy is to oust the Soviet Union from the Persian Gulf and from this region in general?

[Primakov] Yes, this is most deplorable. It is most unpleasant to hear statements of this sort. But it stresses the precise need to eliminate this conflict insofar as the United States could not then use the conflict in its imperialist interest. Because, of course, it is not a matter of ousting the Soviet Union, for, after all, the Soviet Union has no military bases there and the United States will not manage to oust it politically from the Middle East nor from any other region for that matter; it is a question of a U.S. desire to quietly establish its presence there, to simply establish and expand its military presence there.

Now I would like to continue. The point is that it is mainly a Soviet-U.S. matter. Conflicts are of very great significance. The Warsaw Pact cannot be indifferent to the existence of conflicts. Does this mean that the Warsaw Pact is prepared to expand its influence, the influence of its military organization, to areas of conflict in various parts of the world? No. And in this the Warsaw Pact differs sharply from NATO. NATO doctrine, if it exists -- it exists but it is not declared, or so it seems to me -- is based precisely on NATO's desire to spread its influence to countries that are not members of this organization. The Warsaw Pact adheres to a directly opposite position.

The next point, to answer your question. Yes, the Warsaw Pact is interested in eliminating conflicts. This is why the question of conflicts is set down in documents of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact in terms of the need to settle conflicts by political means.

[Zorin] Thank you. Another question for you, Yevgeniy Maksimovich. Were economic questions discussed in Berlin?

[Primakov] Naturally, they were discussed. These questions are of very great significance. They were discussed in terms of a need for economic security -- that is part of universal security -- and in terms of relations between the socialist countries, economic relations between socialist countries, and, primarily, between countries that are members of the CEMA network.

In connection with this, I would like to return to Comrade Gorbachev's visit to Bucharest. He spoke there at the 23 August machinery plant, and during his speech at a meeting of the workers council there, he expressed the quintessence of our approach to economic problems facing CEMA countries. What did Mikhail Sergeyevich say?

First he emphasized the need to intensify economic ties not only because of the wisdom of this, but because of its necessity as dictated by the present moment. In addition, he postulated the issue as follows: Theoretically there can be a dilemma -- either chiefly develop relations between us or develop relations with the West. But this is only a theoretical dilemma, because the West does not favor the development of such relations and because we especially need relations between the CEMA countries to strengthen our unity and for the development of integration.

But if there is only one path, then it must be placed in a realistic framework. Here Mikhail Sergeyevich mentioned one very acute issue. He said: We cannot turn our countries into dumps for goods that are not wanted by the West [ne idut na zapad]. In other words: We do not want it, you take it. [na tebe bozhe, chto nam ne gozhe]. I think it ought to be rephrased: Take it, they do not want it [na tebe bozhe, chto tam ne gozhe].

Of course, we cannot develop our goods exchange with the socialist countries on this basis. Mikhail Sergeyevich stressed this and I think he hit the bull's-eye on this issue. Further, of course, there should be economic cooperation. It should develop in new forms, in the form of direct contacts and direct ties between enterprises of socialist countries. In cases where both sides accept it, this should also take the form of joint companies that jointly carry out the production of various goods.

Naturally, all of these issues came up before the Political Consultative Committee session, and judging by everything, they enjoyed unanimous approval.

[Zorin] The Berlin documents are being treated as a sensation in the West. Today we have talked about their major significance while some in the West circumvent the essence of the question and intentionally present what was achieved in Berlin in a sensational way with the support of a certain preparatory campaign carried out before the meeting. Certain Western circles premeditatedly organized and cranked up a campaign of all kinds of speculation on the topic of divisions between Warsaw Pact member countries. In connection with this, the very possibility of adoption of any major decisions at the session was subject to doubt. Now insofar as these decisions were adopted, this is now being presented almost as something unexpected, as a sensation. Albert Ivanovich, will you give us your opinion on this issue?

[Vlasov] Well, that some Western propaganda and mass media organs have become used to portraying what they wish as reality is hardly new. We have encountered this on many occasions. One outline is characteristic of this. During a meeting with the press, we were asked the following question, specifically by the Western correspondents -- Americans, West Germans, and English: Tell us, what will be the new Soviet initiatives in Berlin? What new recommendations will the Soviet Union unilaterally make at the forthcoming meeting? Later, when we answered these questions, more specific questions followed concerning medium-range missiles in Europe, conventional arms, reduction of armed forces and arms in Europe, and a whole series of other problems.

It should be admitted that we were not just somewhat taken aback by this but surprised, too. We answered them frankly: Do you feel that there have been insufficient initiatives from our side? Let us measure these. So we compared the positions of the Soviet Union, the United States, and its NATO allies, and we compared innovative points in our policies with the approaches of the Western countries, including those of the United States.

As far as the various forecasts are concerned, they are essentially not realistic either in politics or propaganda -- at least that is how I would put it -- because these forecasts were based on very old methods when public opinion in the West was inflated by a certain negative content in relation to the Soviet Union and socialist countries. Here we encountered nothing new, but after the meeting -- and we observed the way the meeting unfolded, saw the interviews by Western journalists, saw how they worked, how they searched for information -- we saw that they gradually lost interest in the topic. It should be mentioned that as this was taking place, their mood was getting worse, because they simply did not know what other questions -- more lashing, more cocky -- to invent.

[Zorin] They had a different social order.

[Vlasov] Yes, a different social order. It was not corroborated, nor could it have been. Because on the way to Studio 9, I saw the foreign press reviews, and one of the papers wrote about the historical significance of the documents adopted in Berlin, about their historical significance. I think this assessment is justified. It is confirmed by the character of the document, its innovativeness, and those problems about which we spoke today. Of course we could not touch on all the problems. It is much too broad and wide. For weeks and months to come these questions will be discussed in various political circles, political discussions, and in the mass media as well. I think that such an appraisal is justified.

[Zorin] Thank you. I think what has been said here will be confirmed in the forthcoming period. The Soviet Union and its allies have taken a new constructive step -- a step which will significantly influence the development of the political process in the world.

Our time on the air has ended. It is left to me to thank you for participating in today's talk, for sharing your thoughts and impressions on the work of the Political Consultative Committee...

[Primakov, interrupting] Unfortunately, there was insufficient time to share the impressions.

[Zorin] Well, in part, let us say. I wish to thank our television viewers for their attention. Until we meet again here in Studio 9. Thank you.

'International Situation: Questions and Answers'

LD052025 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 5 Jun 87

[From the "International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program, conducted by Sergey Pravdin, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator, with Gennadiy Shishkin, international affairs journalist and first deputy general director of TASS; Melor Sturua, Vitaliy Sobolev, Vladimir Pasko, Boris Adrianov, Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, international affairs journalists; and Aleksandr Galkin, correspondent in Vientiane]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Many of our listeners' letters express full support for the new peace initiatives approved at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference in Berlin. They write that the United States and its closest allies should show new political thinking and ties into account. [passage omitted]

Our visitor today is Gennadiy Arkadyevich Shishkin, TASS first deputy general. The first question from our listeners is this: What new fundamental contribution is being made to the practice of today's international relations by the military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact member states approved in Berlin?

[Shishkin] Before answering this question I should like to remind you of what we mean by military doctrine. According to the classical definition, military doctrine is the system of official views and tenets establishing the lines of military construction, the preparation of the country and the armed forces for war, and the methods and forms for conducting warfare. It is drawn up by the political leadership and the main tenets of the military doctrine are, of course, linked with the character of the social system, the policy of the ruling classes, the level of development and productive forces, scientific achievements, and ideas regarding possible war. If we turn to the document that was signed in Berlin last week, we will immediately see for ourselves that it differs fundamentally from the military doctrines which so frequently replace each other in the West.

Firstly, it is a collective doctrine of socialist states, which reflects the common character of their defensive military-political goals and their national military doctrines. Secondly, it is a purely defensive doctrine, which proceeds from the need to maintain an equal balance of military forces at the lowest possible level, and from the expediency of a reduction of military potentials to the bounds of a sufficiency needed for defense. Finally, our doctrine, being strictly a defensive one, proceeds from the fact that under present conditions employment of a military method to resolve any contentious issue is impermissible.

Thus, this document, which is unprecedented in the entire history of international relations and, consequently, in the entire history of military-political alliances, gives an integrated concept of peace, where there must be no room for conducting policy from a position of strength. The military doctrine of the Warsaw Pact, like the military doctrines of each of its members, is subordinated to the task of preventing war, both nuclear and conventional. We proceed from the fact that under present conditions employment of military means to resolve any contentious issue is impermissible. Armed forces and armaments are needed by us exclusively to defend ourselves in the event of an attack. Nothing over and above this is needed by us. We do not regard a single state or a single nation as our enemy. Our main goal is to halt the arms race and bring about true disarmament.

[Pravdin] You emphasized the purely defensive character of the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine. But the West also says it is in favor of peace and is only concerned with the interests of its defense. So what is the difference between our doctrine and theirs?

[Shishkin] Yes, indeed, the West and NATO like to speak about peace. The flow of their peace-making rhetoric increases whenever the legislators are being asked to fork out for yet another armaments program. Every dollar in NATO's military budget is presented as a concern for general peace. But the deeds of the Western countries speak louder than words, and when it is a matter of specific commitments these countries are, at times, also stinting with their words.

In actual fact, take such a provision in the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine as the firm commitment that the Warsaw Pact member states will never under any circumstances start military actions against any state or alliance of states, unless they themselves are the target of an armed attack, and further that they will never be the first to employ nuclear weapons. What could be simpler, it would seem, than to go halfway to meet the Warsaw Pact countries by declaring similar commitments for their part, and to endorse these commitments, following the example of the socialist states, with the signatures of their countries' top leaders in order to give their words the force and validity of an international legal document? Proposals on this score have been put repeatedly to the North Atlantic bloc, but not once has a constructive response been forthcoming.

[Pravdin] What is the practical significance of these doctrines, which, as you mentioned, have been replacing one another in the West?

[Shishkin] Indeed, all of us have witnessed how more and more new doctrines have been proclaimed in the NATO countries, particularly in the United States. They included the well-known Truman Doctrine, which unleashed the cold war, and there also was the strategy of massive retaliation, the strategy of flexible response, and so on. Their names vary, but their exclusively aggressive essence is the same. The Reagan administration, for instance, has extolled the doctrine of neoglobalism. Within the framework of this doctrine, the United States has been attempting to impose itself throughout the world and to mete out rough justice to national and liberation movements and to governments not to its liking.

'International Observers Roundtable' 7 June

LD071758 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 Jun 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio commentator; Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the weekly ZA RUBEZHOM's editorial board, Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer for KOMMUNIST]

[Excerpt] [Andrianov] Hello, comrades. Taking part in our roundtable meeting today are: Dmitriy Antonovich Volskiy, member of the editorial board of the weekly ZA RUBEZHOM, and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, international observer of the journal KOMMUNIST.

Nearly 1 and 1/2 weeks have passed since the conference of the Political Consultative Committee of the participant states of the Warsaw Pact in Berlin, but the documents summing up its results continue to attract the attention of the broadest circles of the world public. That is not surprising. After all, every meeting of the leaders of the seven countries of this defensive alliance is an event of great international significance, and this is especially true of the recent conference in the capital of the German Democratic Republic, which proposed an extensive new program of measures aimed at normalizing the situation in Europe and in the world as a whole. That is a very timely initiative indeed; and one, moreover, that has been undertaken at a moment crucial in the highest degree in the development of international relations. There is every indication that the next month or two will decide whether this year will have been the year of the birth of major compromises, not only on the limitation but on the elimination of a considerable part of the nuclear armories of the Soviet Union and the United States. From this point of view, the meeting in Berlin is seen as one more link in the chain of the consistent efforts of the Soviet Union and of the other participants of the Warsaw Pact to lay a practical foundation for moving towards a world with a smaller quantity of arms and greater security.

The members of our defensive alliance are proving by word and deed that the socialist countries are advocates, not of some sort of cosmetic improvements in international relations, but of renewing them on the basis of recognizing the priority of values common to all mankind. Our fraternal states consider that there is now a greater real possibility than ever before of achieving major accords and agreements; but will this opportunity be seized -- or shall we find that we have let it slip by? It's a question the West must answer by its practical actions.

[Nekrasov] I must say the reactions in the West to the results of the Berlin conference of the Political Consultative Committee make a curious impression. The Western world -- by which I mean the political and public figures, the media and all who have commented on the publication of the results of the conference and on its documents -- has clearly been split into two diametrically opposed camps.

On the one hand, we hear remarks and opinions indicating a desire to come to grips seriously with the content of the Berlin documents and view them in the same context as the other peace-loving initiatives of our country and of the other countries of socialism that the world has recently been witnessing. Thus there is clearly apparent a wish to draw the appropriate practical and positive conclusions from the initiative of the socialist countries. They are calling the results of the Berlin meeting innovative, and saying that they merit the closest attention and study.

In the opinion of West German Foreign Minister Genscher, for example, quoted by KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER, the East and West have now -- I quote -- entered a phase in the course of which both sides have come closer to the moment when a businesslike dialogue will begin. The minister had in mind a dialogue on a wide range of issues, including both arms reduction and the problem of providing for international security in general.

But, on the other hand, many organs of the news media in the West, and some politicians too, have been in a hurry to pretend that the conference in Berlin has been a transitory episode in international life; that it was held, and passed, and contributed nothing much. Also in West Germany, Defense Minister Manfred Woerner has said that the conference of the Political Consultative Committee was, as he expressed it, completely unsensational. Much of the right-wing press has tried to pretend, almost on the day after, that it's as if no such conference had taken place at all.

[Volskiy] Vadim Nikolayevich, it is interesting how they have tried to explain these attempts they've been making to belittle the significance of the ideas and proposals approved at the conference in Berlin. After all, in view of the present worldwide interest in the policy of our country and of the whole socialist community, they have had to justify that position in some way or other.

[Nekrasov] Yes, that's quite right. The necessary maneuver has been carried out. Evidently it was thought up in advance and duly prepared, but I must say that it's essentially a pretty elementary maneuver. Thus on the eve of the Berlin meeting, the Western mass media, obviously not without the knowledge of the propaganda services of NATO, put out the rumor that the conference of the Political Consultative Committee was expected to bring some serious new concessions on the part of the socialist countries. Well, what concessions could these have been? The grounds for prognostications of this kind were precisely nil. As you know, last year the participant states of the Warsaw Pact put forward integrated, comprehensively based proposals for reducing arms and armed forces in Europe. We have still not received anything similar to an intelligible answer from NATO to these radical proposals. We are still waiting for an answer from the camp of the North Atlantic Alliance, which it seems they cannot yet provide: They cannot agree on it in such a hurry. Therefore the rumor of some expected concession -- in other words, unilateral steps by the Warsaw Pact -- on examination turns out to be an obvious provocation by the Western special services. That provocation was necessary, so they could declare as soon as the conference was over that the steps expected of the Warsaw Pact countries had not been announced and that consequently the Berlin meeting had resulted in nothing new.

Behind this approach, one can discern a perfectly definite desire to distract the attention of the public of Western Europe from the proposal voiced in Berlin: A proposal which has been assessed by the progressive section of the Western public and the progressive press as very interesting and alluring. This is the proposal to hold a meeting of representatives of the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO to discuss the military doctrines of the two alliances. Militarist circles in Washington and in the other NATO countries are clearly afraid that this proposal will win public support and that it will be difficult to dismiss it. That is why they are rushing to slam the door shut at once.

Literally the day after publication of the military doctrine document of the Warsaw Pact member states, a U.S. newspaper, INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE carried a dispatch from Brussels stating that NATO headquarters had rejected the call by the Warsaw Pact to hold joint consultations on military strategy. The correspondent of that U.S. paper made no secret of the fact that the NATO representatives were 'wary' of taking part in such talks.

[Andrianov] You mentioned, Vadim Nikolayevich, the critical statement by the West German defense minister, Woerner, concerning the Berlin conference. But here he is in the 1 June issue of the Hamburg paper DIE WELT, saying in an interview that the East's proposal to talk about military doctrines is in accord with NATO's conceptions. This is exactly what our alliance has demanded, says Woerner. So evidently the North Atlantic Alliance is not fully unanimous on this question.

[Nekrasov] Yes, possibly there really isn't any unanimity in the tactical sense -- you're right about that. They don't know in what form they should react. As I've said, it's a proposal capable of capturing the minds of millions of people. It follows incontrovertibly from the Berlin document that the military doctrine of the socialist countries is peaceful and defensive. Now the NATO countries are being invited to collate with the countries of the Warsaw Pact their views on nuclear war and find ways of reaching agreement to reduce the military balance to the lowest level possible -- to what is termed the level of rational defensive sufficiency [razumnaya oboronitelnaya dostatochnost], and no more.

If such a collation of military doctrines were carried out today, what would it show? First of all, it would reveal the aggressiveness of the military plans of the NATO leaders, and their threatening character regarding the very future of the European Continent. That threat is contained in their pronounced unwillingness to denounce first use of nuclear weapons.

[Andrianov] So you assume that the leadership of the NATO countries will try to avoid the proposed meeting with representatives of the countries of the Warsaw Pact to collate military doctrines. Do you think they will succeed in this?

[Nekrasov] Well, I think it's too soon to make predictions about that. All you can say is that these circles will be under very strong pressure. The leadership of the socialist countries, the Warsaw Pact members, have, as you know, expressed approval of the proposals adopted in Berlin. Whether the West likes it or not, the pressure from sober-minded politicians, whole political parties and public organizations advocating detente, this pressure in favor of accepting the proposal of the socialist countries will continue and will undoubtedly become more intense.

[Andrianov] Of course there is no need to dispute that between states, just as between social movements on our planet, there are contradictions, there exist disagreements and divergencies of opinion. Various groups of people in our international community have differing interests. Yet the task of human survival rises above all this. That is the argument on which the new political thinking is based, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized at his meeting this week with representatives of the movement International Physicians for Prevention of Nuclear War.

Our country builds its policy on the foundation of the new thinking. This is confirmed by the major initiatives and actions undertaken by the Soviet leadership in the past 2 years with the aim of lowering international tension and creating an atmosphere of trust, mitigating the nuclear danger, eliminating chemical weapons, reducing conventional arms and armed forces and making the military doctrines exclusively defensive in character. No one can accuse our country of lacking reserves of goodwill. Our proposal on medium-range missiles is vivid proof of that. It is truly unique in its significance. Consider that for decades nothing has been done to reduce nuclear weapons, and our proposal, if implemented, would be a real step toward beginning the process of nuclear disarmament. On top of that it would be of enormous practical, political and, of course, psychological significance.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1520

RELATED ISSUES

FRG OFFICIALS VIEW PACT PROPOSALS

LD301446 Hamburg DPA in German 1409 GMT 30 May 87

[Excerpt] Hamburg (DPA) — Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher (FDP) has given a basically positive reaction to the statement by the summit conference of the Warsaw Pact states on disarmament yesterday. Speaking on Saarland Radio today, Genscher described his impression that the Warsaw Pact is now making an attempt to deal with a number of points that NATO had touched on in its principles for the conventional balance of forces in December last year. Genscher said: "I believe that we are now in a phase where we are coming closer to businesslike dialogue and that is something we can definitely welcome." The statements, Genscher went on, should be calmly analyzed. Hectic reactions are out of place.

Contrary to this, Admiral Dieter Wellershoff, inspector general of the Bundeswehr, expressed skepticism over the Soviet disarmament proposals. He said in *Bild Am Sonntag* that, for all its many disarmament offers, the Soviets had not withdrawn from service or scrapped one single weapon since Gorbachev's accession to power. On the contrary, the arms build-up in the Warsaw Pact is continuing with unaltered strength and rapidity. Conventional superiority, Wellershoff said, provides the Warsaw Pact with the facility for a surprise attack and a wide scale offensive. This corresponds to the strategic aim of conducting a war principally on the opponent's territory. This does not mean, Wellershoff said, that the Russians would be starting a blitzkrieg tomorrow. But they have provided themselves with the military potential for one and that potential is suited to exerting political pressure. [passage omitted]

/8309

CSO: 5200/2547

FRG'S WOERNER DISCUSSES WARSAW PACT PROPOSALS

DW011010 Bonn DIE WELT in German 1 Jun 87 p 4

[Ruediger Moniac article: "Woerner: Warsaw Pact Disarmament Proposals 'Completely Unsensational'"]

[Excerpt] Bonn — In the final communique of the East Berlin summit meeting the Warsaw Pact admitted for a second time that there are "disparities" in the military balance of forces between East and West. Defense Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) pointed out that fact, which is important to NATO'S disarmament efforts. He said in a talk with *Die Welt* that Gorbachev had done it once before, thus recognizing that a conventional balance in Europe could be achieved best by dismantling the Eastern preponderance.

Woerner assessed the Warsaw Pact's disarmament proposals made in East Berlin as "completeley unsensational." He went on to say: "The steps some people expected have not been taken. There is no unilateral withdrawal of Soviet tank divisions. The Eastern proposal to discuss military doctrines corresponds to NATO's ideas. NATO urged it. Here the Warsaw Pact corresponds to the West's desires. I welcome it, but at the same time I must say that the Warsaw Pact doctrine, like the structure of its armed forces, has an aggressive character. As everybody knows, NATO's strategy is purely defensive."

Commenting on the Warsaw Pact's preparedness to "eliminate disparities," Woerner said, "Radical reduction of conventional weapons is the FRG's main concern. However, there is no question that the disparities are to the disadvantage of NATO and the advantage of the Warsaw Pact, which the Soviet Union must eliminate. If the Warsaw Pact urges correction of existing

imbalances by dismantling potentials instead of building up new potentials, I am happy that the existence of disparities has been again recognized. Surprisingly, some people in the West deny it. Obviously some SPD politicians are more Soviet than the Soviets themselves. We are also very much for conventional disparities being eliminated through dismantling. Therefore, I am asking the Warsaw Pact to begin. Negotiations are not necessary."

Woerner pointed out that the Warsaw Pact in Central Europe alone has a preponderance of heavy weapons — 16,000 combat tanks, 29,000 other armored vehicles, 15,000 guns, 1,500 airplanes, and 870 combat helicopters more than NATO. [passage omitted]

/8309

CSO: 5200/2547

FRG PRESS VIEWS WARSAW PACT SUMMIT PROPOSALS

DIE WELT Comments

DW311125 Bonn DIE WELT in German 30 May 87 p 2

[Bernt Conrad article: "And Now the Details"]

[Tex] The East Berlin summit meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries under Mikhail Gorbachev's chairmanship has not announced any propagandistically effective, new disarmament proposals, as many people had expected. However, it did submit proposals to NATO, that are worth being studied closely. They include the suggestion to hold talks this year on both sides' military doctrines and to discuss military imbalances and ways of eliminating them.

In fact, the military doctrines are an urgent subject, if the sides really want to achieve more security through disarmament. The West is in a good position in that respect, because its strategy on principle is defensive. The Soviet union, on the other hand, has embodied in its doctrine the capacity for large-scale offensive. The talks it has suggested will show whether it is really ready to give up that capacity.

In addition, its readiness to eliminate conventional imbalances will have to be tested. In that respect, contradictory statements have been made by Moscow recently. For the eastern bloc summit to address that issue now, constitutes a step forward. However, skepticism remains indicated because while the summit meeting was going on members of the Soviet delegation in East Berlin said that the East's superiority in tanks was offset by the West's superiority in helicopter gunships and tactical aircraft; on the whole, there was therefore an approximate balance.

But in reality the Warsaw Pact armed forces' superiority is obvious — regarding the number of troops, for instance. Therefore, the readiness announced in East Berlin to eliminate partial imbalances does not rule out the necessity to hold a detailed data discussion. The unsuccessful Vienna MBFR negotiations have sufficiently demonstrated how difficult that is.

The initiative by the participants in the eastern bloc summit for an early conclusion of an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear missiles and their offer also to negotiate on short-range weapons must be welcomed. However, that does not mean that a result can be expected.

SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG Article

DW311112 Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 30 May 87 p 4

[Article by "JJ": "Words From the Summit"]

[Text] Could it be that officials in the chancelleries of western capitals heave a sigh of relief? However that may be, speculation that Mikhail Gorbachev would use his appearance in East Berlin to launch another spectacular disarmament proposal to the West has not materialized. The Warsaw Pact summit was laboring behind hermetically closed doors and then only produced general wishes and suggestions. Two things in particular are interesting and worth being followed.

Herbert Krolikowski, number two in the GDR Foreign Ministry, stated that the dismantling of intermediate-range missiles should not "automatically" lead to an "increase in conventional weapons." However, in the same breath, he reiterated one of the most remarkable ideas that the Warsaw Pact has brushed aside for many years: the asymmetric reduction in the military potentials. The side "which has an advantage reduces, but the other side does not increase its potential." It is in the West's interest to examine that abstract offer for its actual political substance, because most imbalances in Europe are at the Warsaw Pact's advantage — ranging from tanks to antitank systems, from short-range weapons to artillery.

What is new is the proposal — vague as it is — that the two alliances should "negotiate" on their military doctrines. To what end, was not said. But NATO should inquire about the details. Many western military experts believe that the Warsaw Pact's doctrine, and in particular the deployment of its forces, is of an offensive nature. In contrast, regarding NATO, not even the principle of "forward defense" applies anymore. The key term for many years has been "defense from advanced-based positions" [vorverteidigung]. That means that the attacker is to be stopped on or on this side of the border. Clarifying the differences and, in doing so, looking a bit over each other's shoulder, would represent a first-class "confidence-building measure."

FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU Comments

DW311129 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 30 May 87 p 3

[Article by "IGL": "Accents"]

[Text] Whoever expected the Warsaw Pact summit in East Berlin to produce epoch-making disarmament proposals, possibly even in the field of conventional weapons, was disappointed. The meeting merely stressed specific points. The Warsaw Pact for the moment considers nuclear disarmament most important, not conventional disarmament. Moscow is still waiting for a binding response by NATO to the proposed double zero solution.

The Warsaw Pact wants a summit meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan this year. The conditions of such a summit were clearly outlined in East Berlin. At such a meeting an agreement would have to be signed on intermediate-range missiles and a framework agreement would have to be concluded on strategic weapons and on the strict observance of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty (ABM).

The elimination of imbalances is to be based on the dismantling, not the increase, of armaments. However, given its superiority in conventional weapons, the USSR would partly have to be ready to make unilateral advance concessions in Europe. Whether it will do so, depends decisively on whether quick successes will be registered in nuclear arms control. The period of change is continuing. So far, nothing has been lost or won — and the Warsaw Pact summit also has changed nothing about that state of affairs.

FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE Editorial

DW311210 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 30 May 87 p 1

[Editorial by "ME": "Susceptible to Blackmail"]

[Text] Is the impression wrong that it does not terribly interest anybody anymore whether the eastern alliance members in East Berlin or elsewhere discuss further disarmament offers to the western alliance or not? The really important thing happened several weeks ago. It was the moment when quantity — fewer weapons systems and the reduction of their ranges twice — changed into security policy quality: Since the obvious agreement of the two leading powers and the voluntary or involuntary nod of approval by those led by them, only effective weapons with so short ranges have been left over that the two parts of Germany have become the area of least security, and the Federal Republic the area of greatest susceptibility.

Our alliance partners within NATO are satisfied — and any country would naturally be satisfied to see the weapons disappear that could reach it. Therefore, the Federal Government was alone, and it was unable to defend itself. Not even its own people — who have for years systematically been told lies about security issues because they wanted to be told lies. What will yet be presented for discussion at disarmament negotiations is hardly worth being considered. The die is cast. The irrelevant phrase that has been pompously reiterated on any given occasion, that never again must a war start from German soil, has revealed its hidden second meaning: Germany will be the only country on which military potential will in the future be targeted from outside. Not for the purpose of war, because the Russians do not want war, but for the purpose of blackmail.

We do not have to wait anxiously for the next half dozen Soviet disarmament proposals. The only thing that is still interesting is the question to what point the Federal Republic as the free part of Germany could be pushed, given the fact that it is the only country exposed to the threat. It is isolated now, without anyone talking about its isolation which in the past everyone had so strongly warned against. It will possibly find it more difficult than ever since its founding to preserve its most important good — freedom in the known and cherished sense.

INTERNATIONAL PHYSICIANS CONGRESS MEETS IN MOSCOW

Gorbachev Sends Greetings

LD291210 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 29 May 87

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow May 29 TASS -- Follows the full text of the message of greetings by Mikhail Gorbachev general secretary of the CPSU CC, to the participants of the 7th World Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War [IPPNW]:

"I wholeheartedly greet the 7th World Congress of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War which has gathered in Moscow.

I regard the emergence and remarkable development of your movement and its universal prestige as yet another good and impressive sign that peace has staunch and convinced supporters and their number is multiplying.

Mankind has no right to lull itself with illusions. It should know the truth about the ruinous consequences of nuclear war for all living things. The truth is bitter but it is also a potent medicine for indifference, apathy, and passivity when it is a matter of saving life on earth.

The bell of your movement is now heard throughout the world. It impels one to act. You honestly say that medicine would be powerless to help people in the chaos of nuclear conflagration. This is really so.

You justly regard as immoral the banking on 'nuclear deterrence' which is permanently fraught with a tremendous danger of an irremediable malfunction. Besides, the arms race swallows resources the utilisation of which for the needs of health care and science would make it possible to stamp out many grave diseases and to improve the health of individuals and mankind as a whole and, I will add, to get rid of many social ills which are known not only to the developing countries but to the developed ones as well.

Your thoughts and ideas of how to preserve civilisation and to cure 'nuclear madness' are understandable to us. We share them. They aroused a broad response at the Moscow forum 'For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity'.

Our country comes out in favour of eliminating nuclear arms. At any moment the Soviet Union is ready to resume the moratorium on nuclear tests and to ban them altogether if the United States and other nuclear powers follow suit.

Peace built on nuclear deterrence is fragile and dangerous. To try to reliably strengthen it through ever new build-ups of arms, ground- or space-based ones, means to go in the direction opposite to the interests of peace.

The present-day situation is a historical challenge to political leaders and to every person. It reminds one of responsibility. We consider it necessary to move on from competition in stockpiling the arsenals of destruction to cooperation in radically reducing them. The Soviet Union is prepared to go its part of the road in good faith. Even though our state has nuclear arms, it will never be the first to use them.

The USSR solemnly states that it is prepared to give them up completely by the year 2000 or earlier, on the basis of reciprocity, of course, and under the most stringent international control.

We are convinced that the first steps towards nuclear disarmament can and should be made without delay. They will serve well the interests of universal security and will add so urgently needed elements of trust to our troubled and interdependent world.

Ideological differences, and political ones, too, should not obstruct our view of the common destinies of mankind and of the priority of life and universal human values. The current period requires bold and urgent actions by all people concerned for the future of civilisation.

I am confident that at this turning point of mankind's history the voice of physicians will continue to sound loudly and authoritatively. Your goals are lofty and humane. I wish you success. I wish the Moscow congress success in its work for the good of universal peace.

[signed] Mikhail Gorbachev

1st Day Activities

PM021109 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 May 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Formula for Saving the World. The Seventh International Congress of 'International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War' Has Opened in Moscow"]

[Text] Freeing the world of nuclear weapons is a really feasible aim. It is with total confidence that reason will gain the upper hand over folly and that the "epidemic to end all epidemics" will not break out on earth that the participants in the Seventh International Congress of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement have gathered in Moscow. This forum, involving more than 2,000 representatives of 55 countries, opened on 29 May at the "Druzhba" concert and sports complex in Luzhniki Park.

The congress was opened by M.I. Kuzin, cochairman of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" movement, director of the A.V. Vishnevskiy Institute of Surgery, and academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences. He quoted the words of Albert Einstein: "We need new criteria of thought if mankind wants to survive," which have been chosen as the motto of the Moscow forum of doctors, and as chairman of the congress organization committee, he expressed satisfaction with the enormous interest shown by the world medical community in the Moscow meeting. Not only doctors and medical scientists are involved in the program, but also eminent political, religious, and social figures, scientists, writers, and journalists.

The congress delegates and guests paid great attention to the message of greetings addressed to the forum of doctors from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The message was read by A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Then J. Pastore (United States), secretary of the movement's executive committee, read out the numerous greetings messages sent to the congress. [paragraph continues]

Wishes for success were sent to the Moscow forum delegates by the UN secretary general, the heads of a number of other international organizations, and by many heads of state and government from all five continents.

The convening of the Moscow congress of doctors has coincided with an important anniversary in medical history. This year mankind celebrates the 10th anniversary of one of the greatest victories -- a victory won not on the battlefield but in the laboratories, clinics, and field expeditions of doctors the world over, who, through joint effort, succeeded in removing smallpox from our planet. R. Rugunda, Ugandan minister of health, dedicated his report to this remarkable success by the doctors of the world. In the same way, through joint effort, he stressed, we can also resolve the main problem of today -- the problem of saving mankind and preserving civilization. Everyone in the world, irrespective of their nationality, religion, or political views, must have the fundamental right to life and health.

Academician Ye.I. Chazov, USSR minister of health, presented a report entitled "The Destruction of Nuclear Weapons -- The Aim of the Physicians' Movement." The congress audience, he said, does not only consist of the approximately 3,000 delegates present here, but also includes the more than 1 million Soviet doctors who share the humanitarian aims of your movement.

It must be pointed out to the credit of the world's doctors, the speaker continued, that they were the first to not only demonstrate on the basis of accurate scientific data all the tragic consequences of a nuclear war, this "epidemic to end all epidemics," but also to offer their own prescription to save the world. It is logical that responsible statesmen always listen to what the public and scientists have to say. How great then was our amazement when the representatives of a number of governments said at the World Assembly of the WHO -- an organization intended to protect the life and health of people throughout the world -- that discussion of the consequences of the nuclear arms race and nuclear war for mankind is not within the competence of this organization and only "politicizes" its activity. I would have liked these gentlemen to have been with us by the beds of the 28 patients who died from radiation sickness as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl AES. The thought that millions of people all over the world could die in the same way is terrible even to us, doctors who come into contact with death every day.

Yes, we doctors have our own policy, Academician Chazov said, and not only are we proud of this, we also strive to make this policy widespread, because it is aimed at guaranteeing the life and health of our peoples and their well-being. We live and work for the sake of this policy. We will not argue with those who claim that peace can only be maintained on the basis of "nuclear deterrence." We will merely stress that the mechanism of nuclear deterrence is not infallible. It is no longer possible to win the arms race, just as it is impossible to win a nuclear war. The main choice in the world today is not between states belonging to different social systems, but between death and survival.

The innovative and comprehensive plan for nuclear disarmament by the 21st century proposed by the Soviet Union, the speaker went on to emphasize, has opened up real prospects for freeing mankind of the threat of self-destruction. What does the world need today to ensure that nuclear arms are eliminated? New thinking, first and foremost. This new thinking is a recognition of the interdependence of all countries in the world today and recognition of the fact that the security of some states cannot be ensured at the expense of others' security. The new thinking encompasses plans to end nuclear weapon tests as soon as possible and plans to eliminate nuclear and other means of mass destruction.

Important elements of creating an atmosphere of trust in our world are restructuring and openness, which determine the essence of the changes taking place in our country. These ambitious tasks can only be carried out in conditions of peace. That is why the Soviet Union's foreign policy and its proposals to strengthen international security, the USSR minister of health stressed, are linked with its domestic policy to an unprecedented degree. We all believe that our dream of a nuclear-free world is realistic. It can only be realized, however, if we doctors convince our peoples of this.

An important condition of peace on earth is the creation of an atmosphere of trust between peoples, countries, and governments. Only then can we jointly resolve the most urgent problems concerning the development of civilization. At the most recent session of the WHO World Assembly, the speaker said, the Soviet Union proposed that all countries of the world combine their efforts in the fight against a danger that is new to us -- AIDS -- and make a voluntary contribution toward the organization of this work. We also proposed that a group of experts be set up to study the possibilities of the peaceful use of space for medical purposes. We do not propose the creation of weapons, but peaceful cooperation in space, a "medical SDI," in the name of the health of mankind. Our slogan is disarmament for development.

We have gathered in Moscow to reach a deeper level of mutual understanding and to outline the new directions of our activity, B. Lown (United States), cochairman of the movement and professor of cardiology at Harvard University, noted. The international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" is in favor of the total elimination of nuclear arms, he said. People in our profession have sworn an oath to destroy all agents capable of wiping out mankind on a massive scale, be it cholera, AIDS, or nuclear arms. As far as we are concerned, their eradication is a categorical imperative from both a medical and a moral standpoint. It is impossible to imagine the kind of circumstances which could justify the use of genocidal weapons.

We must use our energy to convey the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons to everyone. An important role has been played by the Soviet nuclear test moratorium, which lasted for 18 months. This was a far-sighted, historic action which demonstrated the practicability of independent unilateral initiatives and underlined the urgent need for action rather than high-flown words.

Describing the program of action of the international doctors' movement, which is to be discussed at the congress, the speaker highlighted the main tasks. He said:

First, we will continue our efforts to persuade the world public of the need to completely stop all nuclear explosions.

Second, we must continue to agitate against the spread of the nuclear arms race on earth and in space.

Third, we must even more energetically fulfill our mission, namely, to persuade people that the deteriorating standard of living in the world is organically linked with the arms race. Development and disarmament are, without doubt, indissolubly connected.

Fourth, we will promote more civilized diplomacy to counterbalance oversimplified, faceless, dangerous stereotypes.

Fifth, we will broaden the range of our tasks to encourage creative measures conducive to cooperation between doctors on earth and in space.

Doctors are primarily advisers, B. Lown emphasized. To achieve success, we must educate our patients and all who can hear us. We must teach them that in a nuclear world there is either security for everyone or no security at all. People in the East and West must realize that they are not adversaries, but that their real enemy is the mushroom cloud.

Democratic Senator A. Gore (United States) greeted the congress participants. Your movement, he said, makes a considerable contribution to the achievement of a very great aim, the prevention of nuclear war, by reminding us of its monstrous consequences. Yours is a mission essential to mankind, because in our time of peace, war is often transformed into an abstract concept in people's minds.

The prevention of war must become our general strategy, A. Gore stressed. We must all seriously address the problem of mutual fears and mistrust and ensure that every child, whether he is born in the United States, the Soviet Union, or some other corner of the world, has what he deserves -- a secure future.

There then followed the ceremony of presenting awards from the international physicians' movement. D.A. Henderson (United States), V.M. Zhdanov (USSR), M.I.D. Sharma (India), F.K. Karuga (Kenya), and Z.S. de Quadrosa (Brazil) [names as published] received diplomas for their active participation in the fight against smallpox on earth.

An honorary award was presented to A. Hammer, an eminent representative of U.S. business circles and prominent figure, for his contribution to improving the international situation. Accepting the award, he said that he has always admired the outstanding achievements of the physicians' movement, which appeals to man's conscience and inspires the hope that we will find a way to be rid of the nuclear nightmare. It is quite natural that the fraternity of doctors is leading the attack on the nuclear monster. The only possibility of winning a nuclear war is to prevent it from breaking out at all.

IZVESTIYA on Talks, U.S. Role

PM021301 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by special correspondents B. Ivanov and V. Mikheyev: "A Prescription for Mankind's Survival"]

[Text] The seventh congress of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" (IPPNW) movement has ended.

...On the previous day the small conference hall on the second floor of the International Trade Center had been packed to capacity. Those who had been unable to find a seat were sitting on the floor or standing in the gangways. A verbal duel had developed between U.S. Ambassador to Moscow J. Matlock and congress guest Robert Bowman. Note that it was the first time an official representative of the U.S. Administration had participated in an IPPNW congress.

In his speech, which could easily be described as an "Ode to SDI," the U.S. ambassador tried to present the "star wars" program as a panacea promising military security for the United States and apparently safeguarding world peace. His words did not produce a lively response from the audience. It was his opponent who gained the applause.

R. Bowman demonstrated in an emotional and cogent speech that SDI is above all an attempt to safeguard one's own security using weapons and military equipment. And this has never led to disarmament and peace. SDI is an attempt to find a method of waging and winning a nuclear war and of guaranteeing one's own security to the detriment of the other side's security. But in our day, one-sided security is impossible. Our two powers can only survive or perish together.

R. Bowman has behind him 22 years' service in the U.S. Air Force, the Vietnam war (where he flew 101 combat missions), and work in the Pentagon under the G. Ford and J. Carter administrations, where he was in charge of the program for creating types of space weapons -- the prototype of the present SDI. He is now president of the Institute for the Study of Security and Space Issues and author of the book "Star Wars: Stars of Defense or Death" ["Star Wars: A Defense Insider's Case Against the Startegic Defense Initiative"].

"It may seem strange that a man with my career history has become an active opponent of the program I was once actually in charge of," R. Bowman said in an interview with IZVESTIYA correspondents. "But in our country many servicemen believe that the nuclear danger can be avoided only by presenting war. When I realized this, I immediately became an opponent of SDI. I believe that all types of space weapons must be banned. We must not waste time making groundless accusations against one another -- who has overtaken whom in the arms race -- but work together to create an atmosphere of trust and friendship and peaceful cooperation in the world."

"What We Believe In" is what the physicians have called their appeal. It is a knot of pain and anxiety for the future of civilization which is threatened by a nuclear sword of Damocles. It is not a weapon, the physicians tell us, since it deals death even to those who wield it and use it first. It is an instrument of genocide. The total destructive power of the mountains of nuclear weapons accumulated in the world exceeds the lethal potential of 6,000 wars of the scale of World War II. There are now around 4 metric tons of explosive for every inhabitant of earth. Entire nations and states have become nuclear captives and involuntary hostages.

Involuntary? Some claim that these monstrous weapons are a guarantee of international stability and a token of peace. No, say the scientists who have sworn the Hippocratic oath. They burden human relations with fear and the yoke of distrust, keep civilization in a state of constant mobilization, and have turned it into a seething armed camp. What is to be done? The prescription offered by the physicians' movement calls for the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

In their appeal "What We Believe In," they refer to themselves as "abolitionists." This is used to mean supporters of the elimination of slavery in the United States. The physicians want to release people from enslavement to the nuclear arms race and to wrench the world out of a vicious circle.

Their recommendation is that any interim measures which slow down militarization and contribute to increase trust are of benefit. It is extremely important to have a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, which would prevent the creation of new destabilizing types of weapons. [paragraph continues]

The physicians state in their document: "We are opposed to any strategic program, on earth or in space, even one that is claimed to be defensive, the logical consequence of which would be the additional deployment of nuclear weapons." These words are an indictment of the SDI program.

A physician knows better than anyone else the true cost of military appropriations -- according to UN data, expenditure on 1 soldier in Africa, for example, is equivalent to the cost of education, medical treatment, and social security for 364 civilians. The victory over smallpox was achieved at a cost equal to... 3 hours of the endless arms race in the world. Therefore, the physicians at the Moscow forum have plainly stated: "We believe that a joint victory by the East and West over nuclear weapons would help strengthen trust and common sense, which are essential to stop the planet's bleeding and heal the wound through which more than \$2 billion are being lost daily."

These facts must be made available to all, be made public. "Every physician is also a teacher. We must explain to our patients and to the whole of mankind that today security can only be collective," U.S. cardiologist Bernard Lown, cochairman of the IPPNW, said in his speech.

In the breaks between sessions and meetings, we talked with participants and guests of the congress.

"The physicians' words are being heeded not only by their patients; everyone who is alarmed by the nuclear syndrome that is affecting both industrial and developing states is seeking a cure for the disease. Our movement is offering a prescription that can be understood. The funds released from the mortal grip of the arms race could be used for the struggle against famine and epidemics," Richard Muigay [name as published], a researcher in the area of treating tropical diseases in Kenya, told us.

"We decided to hold our annual meeting in Moscow because we believe that Moscow is going in the right direction in the foreign policy sphere," Sidney Alexander, director of the cardiological center at the Lakhi [as published] medical center and former president of the "Physicians for Social Responsibility" organization (a membership of around 40,000 U.S. doctors), said. "We would like to see positive reciprocal actions by the U.S. Administration, both in terms of concluding arms control agreements and with regard to broad international cooperation. The Union of Concerned Physicians lives and is in operation for these noble purposes."

The solidarity of physicians united against the "traumatic epidemic," as the USSR surgeon N.I. Pirogov described war, is based on an obvious fact: Disease is easier to prevent than to cure. Especially as there is no treatment for the nuclear disease. There are only preventive measures.

People of different political opinions, religious views, and nationalities are united by one idea. It has enabled them to rise above the differences and feel they are of the same race -- the human race. When Socrates was asked what nationality he was, the Greek philosopher did not call himself an Athenian, but replied: "I am a citizen of the world." His home was the whole world.

The skies above our common home must be peaceful. It is to this noble goal that the representatives of the most human progress are devoting their experience, knowledge, and energy in offering their prescription for mankind's survival.

Gorbachev Meets Delegates

PM031101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meeting With Representatives of the Physicians Movement"]

[Text] On 2 June, M.S. Gorbachev met a group of leading delegates to the Seventh International Congress of Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.

Welcoming them, he described the congress as another major step in the development of that influential movement. You appear not only as physicians.

You already have accumulated much experience of introducing your ideas into big politics. Over a short period of time, the initiative of several persons has turned into a movement with the participation of more than 150,000 competent people from many countries. Your voice is heeded and reckoned with, because you do not dissipate your energies in conflicting directions, but concentrate on this decisive direction. This has enabled you to warn humanity about the main danger. Hence the prestige of the movement to which, as this congress has witnessed, trade unions, representatives of other professions and prominent public figures are being drawn and who wish to make their own contribution. It is noteworthy that it was attended by representatives of the developing world.

On behalf of the Soviet Government, Mikhail Gorbachev welcomed those present, and through them the whole movement, wishing it every success: We share the aims of the movement and take them into consideration in our policy. We have a common responsibility to bear to mankind.

Mikhail Gorbachev shared the ideas and plans underlying the Soviet Union's current foreign policy.

The task of survival, he said, is rising over all the differences, disputes and disagreements between states, the social movements, the interests of various groups of people. This conclusion underlies the new mode of political thinking.

The world has changed fundamentally over the recent decades. It is confronted with unprecedented problems: the nuclear threat, an ecological crisis, the revolution in science and technology and its social aftermath, and the new role of the mass communication and information media. They concern all. This is a source of the growth of concern and public activeness all over the world.

This tendency of participation in deciding the destiny of their countries and the world as a whole will powerfully increase since the world is interrelated in all of its parts. The fact that various states have different social systems does not cancel that interrelation.

The USSR and the United States, the socialist states of Europe and Asia, Britain and the FRG, India and Australia, Pakistan and Tanzania, Argentina and Mexico, the Arab states, every nation has its own interests. It is necessary to understand this reality. It is necessary to learn to live in a real world. There is no other way around it. Refusing to recognize that is denying the peoples the right to a free choice. Even if a people is in error, it must itself find a way out. And no one, no "superpower" has the right to interfere in that. It does not come easily now to build the policy on diktat, and it should disappear completely in the course of years.

This realization is making headway with difficulty. But this process has already started and involves even the military circles.

The Soviet Union builds its policy on the basis of a new mode of thinking.

Mikhail Gorbachev reminded those present about the major initiatives and actions undertaken by the Soviet leadership over the past 2 years for lessening international tensions and building up an atmosphere of trust, lessening the nuclear danger, eliminating the chemical weapons, ensuring a cut in conventional weapons and armed forces, giving the military doctrines a solely defense character.

Is the West's reaction adequate? No, it is not. They are speculating there whether this is a sign of the USSR's weakness. Maybe this is because it cannot keep up with the race and it is worthwhile to step it up? they reason. We do not meet with the impulses of real policy in response to our impulses, or are simply faced with politicking.

The present moment is very important. It is hard to say when another such chance might appear. A dangerous tendency created by the "war party" can be altered, the spread of the arms race to space can be prevented. [paragraph continues]

It is true that outer space must become another area of rapprochement and mutual assistance, and not a source of new menace for people.

The ideology of "nuclear deterrence" on which NATO policy is based should be overcome. We have seriously analyzed all aspects of this "theory"; its advocates, apparently, have learned nothing either from Hiroshima, or from Chernobyl, whose lessons now are being forgotten. This apparently, suits certain persons. But we know what it is like.

Nuclear weapons are being upheld, and everything is being done to upgrade them. The programs for their use that are being drawn up specify the stage of war at which the particular kinds of weapons should be used against specific targets, the scope of their use and so on and so forth. It is to condition people to the idea that this is a natural thing, that it is necessary for security. In reality, the concept of "nuclear deterrence" is a false, dangerous, and deeply amoral position.

Answering numerous questions of interlocutors about nuclear weapon tests, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the USSR is prepared to announce a moratorium together with the United States even tomorrow. He agreed with Professor Lown that it is sought to shroud the problem of tests in the midst of talk about verification [kontroll].

The United States has not taken a single step to meet us halfway on the question of tests. Being realists, we agreed to advance bit by bit and proposed in Geneva a draft of a stage-by-stage advance toward full-scale talks on a test ban. But the immediate announcement of a bilateral moratorium could be an initial step. Why shouldn't the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet adopt a law restricting the size of the tests to 1 kiloton and reducing their number to the minimum?

But we have a feeling that the U.S. Administration is creating a vicious circle: It is blocking strategic nuclear arms reduction, and links an end to testing with progress in strategic nuclear arms reduction. We again come up against the wish to preserve nuclear arms, cost what it may, even though this contradicts what we had agreed upon with the President and Geneva in Reykjavik.

Mikhail Gorbachev described those forces capable of compelling the governments to advance toward a world without nuclear arms, and expressed confidence that this aim is realistic. He assured the interlocutors that the Soviet Union will continue acting vigorously, that it will not let slip a single chance and moreover, will be acting in such a way that other chances should appear. But this will, naturally, be done on the basis of equal security.

We have vast reserves of goodwill. This is shown also by our proposals on medium-range missiles. Nothing has been done for decades to reduce nuclear arms, and this would be a real step toward starting the process of nuclear disarmament, would have vast practical, political and psychological importance.

Mikhail Gorbachev supported one of the important trends on which the physicians movement works; namely, the explanation of the relationship of disarmament with development, of the arms race with crying economic needs, and not only in developing countries, but in industrialized states, with problems of poverty, health services, education -- wherever the Moloch of militarism takes away huge funds from millions of people. Those who make money on the arms race presenting this as "concern" for national security should be exposed.

Professor Lown spoke during the conversation more than once. So did most of the participants in the meeting. They shared the impressions about the congress which just ended. They noted its specific features: it was the most representative, had the greatest number of delegates so far and it was marked by high intellectual intensity, the depth of the analysis of problems and unprecedented enthusiasm, breadth of contacts, substantive and business-like character of debates, the atmosphere of high responsibility, openness, honesty and clarity of positions. The participants in the meeting linked all this with the atmosphere of greater openness and of the reorganization in the country which was the venue of the congress.

Mikhail Gorbachev strongly supported the idea expressed by Professor Lown that if the whole world debated the problems of survival as honestly, openly and deeply as this was done at the Moscow congress of physicians, these problems could be resolved promptly.

The final document of the seventh congress was presented to Mikhail Gorbachev. Expressing gratitude for interesting ideas advanced at the congress and in the conversation -- which will be taken into consideration in Soviet policy -- for confidence and for wishes of successes to the Soviet people who took the road of profound change, Mikhail Gorbachev spoke highly of the activity of physicians at this responsible and crucial time.

Taking part in the meeting were Professor Bernard Lown, U.S. cochairman of the movement, and Louisa Lown; one of the founders of the international physicians movement Academician Yevgeniy Chazov, USSR health minister; Academician of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences Mikhail Kuzin, the Soviet cochairman of the movement, director of the Vishnevskiy Institute of Surgery; vice presidents of the movement: Professor Lars Engstedt (Sweden), Ian Maddocks (Australia), Dr. Donald Bates (Canada), Academician Susan Hollan (Hungary), Dr. Rene Bresquet (Argentina); secretary of the executive committee of the movement Dr. John Pastore (U.S.); executive director of the movement C. Nugent (U.S.); president of the U.S. organization "Physicians for Social Responsibility" Viktor Sidel; Professor Ulrich Gottstein (FRG); academicians of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences: Leonid Ilin, director of the Institute of Biophysics, and Nikolay Bochkov, director of the Institute of Genetics.

Aleksandr Yakovlev and Anatoliy Dobrynin took part in the meeting.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

RELATED ISSUES

JOINT SOVIET-JAPANESE EXHIBITION ON NUCLEAR THREAT

PM031305 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 May 87 Second Edition p 5

[A. Lyutyy report: "A Warning"]

[Text] This is precisely how the exhibition which opened in Moscow yesterday is perceived. It gives real and graphic substance to the idea about the impermissibility of nuclear war by taking us back to 2 days which were tragic for the whole of mankind -- the days when atom bombs were dropped on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The stands display terrifying denunciatory photographic evidence and tangible proof of barbarism.

The exhibition is entitled "Nuclear Weapons -- A Threat to Our World" and was organized jointly by the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, UN departments concerned with disarmament and public information, and the Japanese organization "Soka Gakkai International." Even though the exhibition focuses on the past, it is also about the planet's present which is clouded by the enormous shadow of stockpiled nuclear weapons. The stands also offer statistical data: The total estimated explosive power of nuclear weapons stockpiled in the world is 1 million times greater than the power of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. About 200,000 persons died when Hiroshima was bombed. A simple calculation would show that the use of the global arsenal of nuclear weapons could destroy 200 billion persons, in other words a number of people that is 40 times greater than the earth's population.

Mankind must halt this, it deserves a brighter future. That was the keynote of speeches at the solemn opening of the exhibition in Moscow, following its tour of 16 major cities in the world.

P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, took part in the opening ceremony.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW: PACT DOCUMENTS, INF

PM011503 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 87 Second Edition p 4

["International Review" by Igor Melnikov]

[Text] Cohesion and Unity [subhead]

Last week the capitals of two socialist states were the focus of the world public's attention. They were Bucharest, where M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was paying an official friendly visit, and Berlin, which was the venue for a routine session of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference.

The cohesion, unity, and pooled efforts of the socialist community countries have become a constant factor allowing them to defend the fraternal states' security and sovereignty and bar the way to those enamored of military adventures. Let us cast our minds back to the years we have lived through together. They were years of the reinforcement of the just postwar borders of Poland and Czechoslovakia, the recognition of the GDR in international law, the opening of the iron pincers forming the blockade of Cuba, and the fraternal hand of selfless aid extended to Vietnam, which was struggling against U.S. aggression. The event referred to in the Soviet leader's 26 May speech at a Bucharest rally was a landmark in European history: It was there that the socialist states put forward the initiative for an all-European conference.

Now a new event of exceptional importance has taken place. Its scale and truly global importance was noted universally by politicians and the broad international public as soon as the world news agencies' teletype machines reported on Friday [29 May] in full or in part about the documents of the Berlin meeting -- the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference communique and "On the Military Doctrine of the Warsaw Pact States."

Wherein lies the continuing importance of these documents? The leaders of seven of Europe's socialist states, synthesizing in the documents the determining factors of mankind's development -- the course of world events, the changes in international relations, the growing interdependence of states, scientific and technical progress, and the creation [sozdaniye] of weapons of unprecedented destructive force -- reaffirmed the need for new thinking.

The only truth is that there can be no winners in a nuclear war. That is why, as the communique states, the cardinal task is to prevent war, exclude it forever from mankind's life, maintain world peace, end the arms race, and switch to specific disarmament measures -- first and foremost, nuclear disarmament measures. The Warsaw Pact countries have called on all states and peace-loving forces to pool their efforts in strengthening trust in relations between states -- particularly states belonging to different social systems -- and between their military-political alliances.

The provisions of the Warsaw Pact's military doctrine, which is defensive in nature and proceeds on the basis of the need to maintain equilibrium of military forces at the lowest possible level and the expediency of reducing military potentials to the limits of adequacy needed for defense, are imbued with a spirit of reason and justice. "The Warsaw Pact states," it says, "will never under any circumstances initiate hostilities against any state or alliance of states, if they are not subjected to an armed attack themselves. They will never be the first to use nuclear weapons."

The world's press was not slow in responding to the results of the Berlin conference. "The Warsaw Pact Organization," THE WASHINGTON POST noted, "has urged NATO to start joint consultations on military strategy, which would be the first official meetings between the rival alliances." LE MONDE of Paris also drew attention to the proposed consultations on military doctrines and military equilibrium in Europe.

London's FINANCIAL TIMES points out that the "proposal to restrict the sides' ability to carry out a surprise attack or offensive is a new step after the Warsaw Pact states' proposal to reduce armed forces in Central Europe by 25 percent." The conclusion drawn by REUTERS is typical: The results of the conference reaffirm the impression that, in the Soviet Union's opinion, it has already put forward enough proposals on nuclear missiles and conventional arms, and it is now time for the West to formulate a united response.

The foundation of the socialist countries' successes is their healthy and dynamically developing economy. The community has set its sights on intensifying the integration process in every possible way, switching cooperation to primarily economic methods, developing production sharing and specialization in every possible way, establishing direct production ties, and creating scientific production associations.

The main motive force for the fraternal peoples' efforts in developing the community's economic potential is the conviction that in the socialist world working people's lives should be richer, more prosperous, and fuller. They should become so not in some far-off future, but within a very short period so as to ensure that with every passing month we all feel the gratifying results of our accelerated labor and the results of revolutionary restructuring.

Disarmament: Who's Who? [subhead]

Socialist society's progress can only be ensured under conditions of peace. Today the USSR and its allies are putting their unremitting energies into solving the most important question of all: How to avert the nuclear threat. Waves of incantations flood over us from the West: Security must be built on deterrence, primarily nuclear deterrence. No, says the socialist world in response to these schemes, our approach is fundamentally different: Security must be built by moving toward a world without weapons or violence.

An example of such a world has been responsibly worked out by the Soviet side. It is depicted in detail in our program for reducing and entirely eliminating nuclear and other types of mass destruction weaponry, and is reflected in our firm "no" to the idea of spreading the arms race to space and in our continuing call for an end to nuclear tests.

It was only this week that the USSR stated its firm support for the world community's decision to convene the third UN General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament in 1988. The time has come for the United Nations to recognize that they are an integral body which can regulate the equilibrium of universal security not by force of arms but by reason and morality. Our country -- as the Soviet foreign minister's letter to the UN secretary general states -- proposes proclaiming the nineties the decade of building a nonviolent world free of nuclear weapons.

"Disarmament and development" is the formula under which the socialist world proposes solving the task of safeguarding mankind's future. This formula, embodying new political thinking, is not abstract. The Warsaw Pact states are filling it with specific content, both jointly and individually.

In a few days it will be a year since they presented all countries of our continent with a program for reducing armed forces, tactical nuclear arms, and conventional arms in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. Their other peace-loving steps are common knowledge. The ideas of creating zones free of nuclear and chemical weapons are directly linked with the GDR, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania. The fraternal countries made a joint initiative at the United Nations to create a comprehensive international peace and security system. They also put a proposal to the NATO members to freeze the military spending of both alliances' states for 1-2 years. They worked out measures to promote the appearance of a convention banning and eliminating chemical weapons. The comprehensive Polish plan put forward in May for reducing arms and strengthening confidence of central Europe is an important action in this context.

In short, there is no need to guess which side is leaning toward peace, disarmament, and good-neighborliness.

Through force of circumstance, the main question on the agenda of international life today is that of eliminating medium-range missiles in Europe. I think I would not be wrong in citing as one such circumstance the very great level of readiness to move from a draft agreement to an actual document, and this despite the obstacles that have emerged in recent weeks.

We recall the events that were unleashed after the announcement of the Soviet initiative on medium-range missiles 28 February. At first one heard statements throughout the West that agreement was possible in principle. But suddenly various "but's" sprang up and there was a flurry of provisos and rhetorical questions. However, it is now time to say to those making such utterances: There's Rhodes, go ahead and jump. (This is stated in Aesop's fable about an irrepressible braggart who claimed that he only made his gigantic leaps on the island of Rhodes).

However, the West is in no hurry to jump. It started stating that medium-range missiles should not be destroyed unless the question of operational and tactical missiles were resolved at the same time. But when the USSR agreed to also eliminate that kind of weapon, NATO circles soon came up with a new proviso: It is necessary, so

they claimed, to reject the 100 warheads that were to remain on the Soviet and U.S. sides in Asia under the Reykjavik accords. But to the desperation of the NATO planners, this knot was also untied -- a few days ago Moscow stated that this, too, was not ruled out.

What are the genuine difficulties involved with talks? They are rooted in NATO ruling circles' virtual iron grip on the concept of nuclear deterrence. The difficulties are multifaceted. Some stem from the U.S. position. Others relate to the position of Washington's allies. The rider that the "zero option" on medium-range missiles in Europe would remove one component from NATO's "flexible response" strategy and, subsequently -- so it is claimed -- put an end to the entire coordinated defense system, is common currency among their circles. Surprising sluggishness is being displayed by Bonn, which has still not finally determined its position with regard to operational and tactical weapons with a range of more than 500 km.

There are also black spots in the position of a number of other U.S. allies. The mood of those who sow suspicion and tension was reflected the other day by the French newspaper LE FIGARO. "Certain people are scared," it stated, "that these talks could jeopardize our security, and are refusing to make even the slightest effort in this complex situation. Certain people in our country persistently talk about a 'new Munich'...."

What can be said about the LE FIGARO article? I think it is just one step away from blasphemy. To avoid presenting the entire French press in a dismal light, we will cite the opinion of another Parisian newspaper L'HUMANITE, the organ of the Communist Party. West European politicians, it notes, continue to make contradictory statements. They would like to reject the Soviet initiatives; however, if they did so, they would come up against the displeasure of broad public circles in the West who advocate the removal of the threat of nuclear war.

Unlike government cabinets, millions of West Europeans are very resolute. Take the FRG, for instance. Its government has still not formulated its attitude to the latest Soviet medium-range missile proposals. However, the country's citizens have quite definitely made their choice. A recent poll attests that 85 percent of the population advocates the "zero option," both for medium-range missiles and for operational and tactical missiles. What is interesting is that these sentiments prevail among 78 percent of inhabitants who usually vote for the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] bloc.

This party bloc has already had to reap the bitter fruit of its "lack of resolution." Chancellor Kohl's approach to this burning issue, London's THE TIMES noted, will cost the parties votes at the Land elections. The CDU has already suffered defeats in Hamburg and the Rhineland-Palatinate.

These events allowed the Hamburg magazine DER SPIEGEL to state with profound sarcasm: "The chancellor's latest achievement is that neither East nor West will know just what he actually wants with regard to disarmament."

Now, if we believe the following statement from THE NEW YORK TIMES, "Helmut Kohl has decided, albeit unwillingly, not to oppose the conclusion of an agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union eliminating short-range missiles."

Well, let us wait and see, as the saying goes!

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW TALK SHOW: PACT DOCUMENTS, INF, SDI

LD051404 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 5 Jun 87

["Top Priority" program, presented by Pavel Kuznetsov, with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhanov of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the USA and Canada]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Kuznetsov] The Berlin meeting of the Warsaw Treaty's Political Consultative Committee, which is an equivalent of an East European summit, and a summit of the leading Western nations in the fabled city of Venice, Italy, are currently by far the two most important events, so I suggest that we start our program with taking a look at the outcome of the Berlin meeting, which wrapped up its work, 2-day meeting, in the German Democratic Republic, late last month. Who would like to begin?

[Bogdanov] Let me concentrate in this Top Priority on the major document of the Warsaw Treaty meeting, which is to my mind its doctrine.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, please go ahead.

[Bogdanov] You know, let's imagine for a while, Pavel, you have a PC, personal computer, you've just bought it and you're looking in it, trying to understand how to handle this bloody thing. You need a manual.

[Kuznetsov] Yes, I'm so technically backward I need a manual even for a telephone.

[Bogdanov] Yes, you need a manual even for a telephone. Now, if you make a parallel between the weapons systems and PC you will see the same situation. You can build up weapons systems. You can build up weapons systems, but without programming it how to use it it's a dead thing, useless thing. The doctrine, it's exactly the thing which is leading the use of nuclear first of all weapons and all the other weapons. [as heard] That's the meaning of the doctrine.

[Kuznetsov] So the idea was to compare the doctrines, on both sides?

[Bogdanov] Yeah. And I would like to demonstrate to our listeners the importance of that paper. I mean without doctrine your nuclear and conventional forces are just dead forces, useless forces. That's the importance of that paper, number one. Now two comments which to my mind make the whole thing look very, very interesting. For the first time in the history of the nuclear, of the military treaty, an alliance, military alliance, publishes openly its military doctrine. Number two: in the whole history of the international relations and in the history of political-military alliances, we have such an open paper, you know, published for the eyes of everybody. It's significant by itself. Number three: our listeners and we sitting here remember that for the Western alliance, first of all for NATO, it was a very big problem for maybe last decade what is the military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty, what is the military doctrine of the Soviet Union? [as heard]

I would like to call our listeners' attention to two points. Number one: it's defensive; it's defensive not only by its definition, by its own. It has been supported by the whole essence, you know, of the doctrine. And the second most important point is that such, this very doctrine of Warsaw Treaty excludes surprise attack. And I believe that is most important thing [words indistinct] because that's the main worry of our Western partners -- a surprise attack. And if you read the doctrine you will see that we are going as far as suggesting, as withdrawing all offensive weapons systems with the capability of surprise attack.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, thank you, Professor Bogdanov, but my question is neither of the two sides has ever said that it has territorial claims to each other, I mean to the other side, and both sides have always said that their doctrines are defensive. So, speaking of military doctrines, what's there to discuss, what's there to compare?

[Plekhanov] Well, of course, nobody talks about preparing for offensive wars nowadays. The world is too civilized for that. But now we have a challenge. In the nuclear age, at this time in this interdependent world, the room for the use of force is almost nonexistent. You can't fight a war in Europe, not just nuclear war, you can't fight a conventional war either because it will turn nuclear, because of the explosions of all those power, nuclear power plants. It will be tantamount to the use of nuclear weapons. And not only that -- the world has become too fragile and too small for fighting wars in it. And yet we have the traditional approaches, both in the West and in the East, to viewing military power, and military defense, as the best way to provide for national security of countries. Now, what we are suggesting now, what's the essence of the Warsaw Treaty's statement on military doctrine, is that we must take specific steps, concrete steps, take actions, in order to dismantle those elephants, or those old mastodons of the past, which we have created. The military potentials which, even though they are defensive, must be restructured in such a manner as to make offensive war unthinkable; technically unfightable, not just unwinnable but unfightable. And this is a very important thing. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] After 6 long and wrenching weeks West Germany made known its final position on the issue of medium-range issues, missiles, in Europe, and it attaches, I mean Bonn attaches, the elimination of Soviet and American missiles in Europe with its right to keep 72 Pershing-1A missiles and warheads on German territory. Well, in Venice the leaders of the seven industrial nations of the West are going to discuss arms control at length. And what's more, according to reports from all those nations, Western nations, the Reagan administration would like to forge a united front of the West on arms control; that is to discuss the nuts and bolts of the process, ranging from SDI and strategic offensive arms to conventional weapons. Could you outline the differences on arms control between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Treaty organizations, and perhaps some common bonds and some common ground, if any?

[Bogdanov] Well, I feel and I would like to say that if they are going to build up a real arms control front in Venice, let them do so. We will just be very happy to take part in reducing arms. But my suspicion is that it would not be as easy and as simple as that, because I have a feeling that both sides, and even among the seven, you have quite shades, different shades of opinions, different accents, and of course you have a basic difference between NATO and Warsaw Treaty. And what I mean by that: Of course we recognise that we have disparities and we have asymmetries, and then the basic difference to my mind in the approach -- our approach is OK, you have asymmetries, you have differences, let's decrease them. The side which has more, or the other side claims they have more; OK let's cut it. Not to build up to match the other side, (?just decrease it).

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, a mutual build-down.

[Bogdanov] A mutual build-down, and that's becoming a very, you know, crucial point of the whole arms control business. And if you start seriously talking about conventional [as heard] and that's a high time you know to talk about that, that might be stumbling block you know in the approach. So, I hope very much that they will touch upon that question in Venice.

[Kuznetsov] Let me at this point remind our listeners that they are tuned to Top Priority, coming from the North American service of Radio Moscow. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, your host, and, at this point, I suggest that we take a break from global issues and take up this unprecedented flight by 19-year-old Mathias Rust of West Germany, who flew all the way from Helsinki, Finland, to [words indistinct]. My question is: He did land his single-engined Cessna near Red Square; in my view, there is more to it than just having a young daredevil, a fanatic of flying. Well, what do you think about all this? I ask you to be candid and forthcoming. Well, after all such things don't happen every day. Professor Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well, in the first place, I think I was shocked like many Soviet people by the negligence of the antiaircraft command, which did not take the steps that were, that were to be taken. The plane should have been downed by nonmilitary means. It should have been forced to land, and there are ways to do it.

[Bogdanov] You know, in our times, when you have plenty of terrorists flying, running doing terrible things, where was the guarantee that (?what), that was a terrorist plane carrying even a small nuclear device? That's what worries me.

[Kuznetsov] Perhaps there may be some other implications.

[Plekhanov] The other clear implication is that I think, I think it's an illustration of why, for instance, the SDI is wrong, because an SDI would put the security of a country in dependence of the work of complex technical systems, and here you've seen a graphic illustration of how a very, very sophisticated, big, far-fetched....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] You know, I'm rather a senior citizen, I have been living in this world over 50 years now, and I have my lifetime experience, which is more complex gadget you have, more it is doomed to failure. [as heard] The SDI is something unimaginably complex. I can't imagine how many, you know, failures inherent in building (?that).

[Kuznetsov] We have become too advanced to stop [word indistinct] flyers, that is what it boils down to in my opinion. As time is running out on us, let's go back to East-West relations. If there is an INF accord, that is an accord, an agreement, on eliminating Soviet and American missiles, 735 of them will be eliminated from Europe, and their range is up to 5,000 km, or up to 3,000 miles. This means that the elimination will take care of 20 percent of all warheads now in Europe, and of 2 percent, only 2 percent, of worldwide stockpiles of nuclear arms. So, my question is: Is it really such a big deal? Professor Bogdanov.

[Bogdanov] Yes, it's a great deal because we have been talking of that for the last 14 years, and at last we may start doing it. Even half a percent would be a great deal.

[Plekhanov] I think it would make a nice sight if somebody filmed a documentary of the destruction of a few of those missiles. It would, I think, be like a feast for humanity.

[Kuznetsov] And taking out those, nuclear, nuclear stuff and using it for peaceful purposes.

[Plekhanov] Using it for some peaceful purposes, of course, of course, as nuclear fuel, I don't know how it can be used, but I think it's a very important -- not just symbolic, but substantive -- step. It's a first step down the road of nuclear disarmament. [passage omitted]

[Kuznetsov] Before intermediate nuclear missiles are scrapped, and let's hope this will be done, Europe will most certainly become a completely different place, and, despite the fact that thousands of smaller nuclear arms will remain there. What do you think will be the long-term implications, political, geopolitical and military, if this happens, for the continent?

[Bogdanov] First of all, more trust will emerge. What does it mean? More cooperation will emerge as the first consequences of that, more cooperation in all fields. And you have quite a new opening. You know, I would not dare now, even to, with the biggest fantasy, you know, to predict, but I have a very strong feeling that positive changes of great importance will take place.

[Kuznetsov] In other words, you're suggesting that such a deal will spark a chain reaction in other fields.

[Bogdanov] That's what I believe.

[Kuznetsov] There are suggestions that there will be efforts in the West to make up for the loss of those missiles by beefing up conventional arms. Do you agree with such a prediction?

[Plekhanov] Well, I don't think that it's inevitable. I think that things may evolve in another direction. The rationale behind this idea of compensating for nuclear arms reductions with a conventional buildup, the rationale rests on a totally false picture of the intentions and the capabilities of the Warsaw Treaty, and that's why this doctrinal statement which we referred to, that's why it's so important to talk about now.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you very much for coming to our studio. We've come to the end of Top Priority. I am Pavel Kuznetsov your host. Good-bye until next week at the same time.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

IZVESTIYA ON U.S., USSR POLICIES ON ASIAN SECURITY

PM021429 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 87 Morning Edition pp 4, 5

["Political Observer's Opinion" column by Vikentiy Matveyev: "Asia and the Example of Europe"]

[Text] The problem of curbing the nuclear arms race is global by nature. Mass destruction weapons used in just one region would pose a threat to all of mankind, both because of the chain reaction of the expansion of conflict, and because of the very nature of these weapons, whose deadly effect cannot be contained on a local scale.

There is also another aspect to the problem. Having established such a widespread network of military bases in other countries, the U.S. military also has sited its nuclear weapons on a broad geographical scale. The book "Nuclear Battlefields: Global Links in the Arms Race" by W. Arkin and R. Fieldhouse, published in 1985, points out that 677 major installations of the "nuclear infrastructure" are sited in 40 countries in the world, including some which adhere to a "nuclear-free" policy such as, for example, Japan, Canada, and Spain; these installations include storage facilities for nuclear weapons, command centers, early warning radar systems, and communications centers used to coordinate operations involving the transportation of nuclear weapons and similar things.

As a result of well-known factors, it is Europe that is now the most "ripe" for major steps in freeing it from nuclear missile weapons. Accord between the USSR and the United States on the basis of what was agreed between the two countries at the Reykjavik summit would pave the way along this major avenue. This question is one of many being discussed at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

People in countries on other continents are keenly interested in the progress of the Geneva talks not simply from a theoretical viewpoint; there is every possibility that what is planned for implementation in Europe could be realizable on a global scale. The Asian and Pacific region is highly important in this respect. It is second only to Europe in terms of the concentration of nuclear weapons, and these weapons belong mainly to the United States.

In the first place, it is necessary to point the finger at the U.S. West Coast, at Alaska where there are bases for these weapons. That is where two of the six U.S. unified commands operate: The Pacific Command (Pacom), created back in 1947, and the Central Command (Centcom), set up in January 1983. Since the end of 1979, following a brief period of "respite," Washington again embarked on active military preparations in this vast region. Thus, the numerical strength of U.S. servicemen under Pacom increased from 299,000 to 360,000 between 1978 and 1984. It is perfectly justifiable to assume that a considerable proportion of the increased forces was required by the United States to man nuclear means.

The basis of the U.S. Pacific Fleet comprises 6 aircraft carriers with 675 aircraft stationed on them. Some 200 of them are designed to use nuclear weapons. Considering the range of these aircraft, they are capable of delivering strikes deep within Soviet territory in the Far East. The Pentagon has stationed "Lance" missiles with nuclear warheads in South Korea. A U.S. base has been fitted out on Diego Garcia Island in the Indian Ocean. The distance in a straight line between it and important USSR centers in the European and Asian parts of the country could be covered by bombers, especially if fitted with cruise missiles.

These are the indisputable facts. "The U.S. Administration," M.S. Gorbachev declared when speaking in the Kremlin 19 May, "wants to leave in Asia nuclear means deployed against the Soviet Union, and this forces us to seek a response, to maintain the balance of forces there." This is why the USSR proposed in Reykjavik that 100 warheads each would be retained on medium-range missiles by the USSR in Asia and by the United States on its territory, but not in Alaska, since the aforementioned Soviet missiles in the eastern part of the country cannot reach U.S. territory.

At the same time, the USSR has repeatedly declared its readiness to solve the medium-range missile problem on a global basis; in other words to reach accord on the complete elimination of this category of weapons. We propose that movement be started right away along routes leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons in Asia.

As for medium-range missiles specifically, our country expresses readiness to eliminate [likvidirovat] the 100 warheads for missiles in this category -- which it was proposed would be retained -- provided the United States agrees on the removal [ustraneniye] of its nuclear means sited in some Asian countries and the withdrawal [otvod] of its aircraft carrier flotilla in the Pacific beyond agreed positions. Of course, the condition that the United States has no medium-range missiles on its territory remains in force.

The creation of nuclear-free zones in Asia would be an important step in the direction of freeing the continent of mass destruction weapons. Our country has signed the appropriate protocols to the Rarotonga Treaty on the creation of such a zone in the South Pacific, something that the United States has not done. Washington's stance is equally negative with regard to the creation of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean. The idea of such a zone has encountered broad support within the United Nations. However, the convening of the planned international conference on the Indian Ocean has been postponed though the fault of the United States.

Official circles in Washington reacted negatively to the Soviet proposal on ways to solve the medium-range problem on a global basis. It is claimed that the United States has no medium-range missiles in the Asian and Pacific region, and, consequently, there is nothing there for it to reduce or eliminate. Even though this is not actually said, the following conclusion may be drawn: People in Washington are letting it be understood that Europe's example is not suitable in this case. Is this really so?

It must be pointed out, first, that statements about the "desirability" of eliminating USSR and U.S. medium-range missiles on a global basis have been made repeatedly by the very same official U.S. circles. However, the situation in the Asian and Pacific region is not identical to that prevailing in Europe. A considerable proportion of the grouping of U.S. general purpose forces, with their fist in the shape of aircraft carriers, is to be found in the West Pacific, in other words, in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet Far East. We cannot fail to take this substantial fact into account.

Washington is exerting constant pressure on Tokyo, urging Japan's ruling circles to step up military preparations. High-ranking U.S. spokesmen are reasoning as if Japan were already a member of NATO. Addressing a Senate subcommittee a few days ago, C. Weinberger declared: "All of us -- Japan, the United States, and NATO countries -- must do more." He went on to clarify that his appeal concerns the "defense of the Pacific region." It appears that Japan is being tied to NATO, and NATO to U.S. military preparations in the Pacific.

It is an even more amazing fact that some Tokyo figures pretend that these facts do not exist and, with a stubbornness worthy of a better application, speak of the "importance" of the removal [ustraneniye] by the Soviet Union of the 100 medium-range missile warheads which, according to the Reykjavik accords, the USSR and the United States would be entitled to retain in the specified geographical regions. The Japanese Government could assist progress in this sphere were it not for the fact that it closely follows Washington in its opposition to any real steps toward reducing the level of military confrontation in the vast Asian and Pacific region.

The Soviet Union will not be found wanting with regard to a positive response. We have been prepared and will continue to make efforts to ensure that movement along the path of nuclear disarmament in Europe and Asia fuses into a single Eurasian process, which could give a powerful impetus to the creation of an all-embracing system of international security.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

SOVIET GENERAL DEFENDS POLICY OF NUCLEAR RETALIATION

WA261030 Moscow LITERATURNYA GAZETA in Russian No 19, 6 May 87 p 3

[Speech by D.A. Volkogonov, deputy chief of the Main Political Administration of the Soviet Army and Navy, to the Plenum of the board of directors of the USSR Union of Writers -- date and place not given]

[Text] I would like to dwell on the question of the relationship between the concept of new thinking and literature. The matter is, as we understand it, that new thinking is not a new world view, but its new facet, connected first of all with the profound realization of those terrible realities of the nuclear age, to which we cannot close our eyes. They are, they exist. However, it often happens that people look at these realities -- I would call them the terrible imperatives of the nuclear age -- only through the prism of apocalypse.

In reading some current artistic works or publicists' articles you see that often the inspiration of the artists is in fact devoted to depicting the impending apocalypse. This is hardly correct. We understand how really threatening these dangers are, but some of these invocations and unending intimidations now inadequate. The new thinking, I emphasize, is a profound realization of those new realities which have arisen in the nuclear world. As we live, we act and we fight for renewal under the conditions of these realities, we are obliged not only to create, but also to hold back a potential aggressor from adventuristic steps. It seems that one of the best articles on the dialectic of these realities was that which was recently written by A. Prokhanov in LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA, in which he stated very well that it is not at all required that we forego our ideas or our socialist values while carrying out the struggle for peace and implementing the long-awaited renewal.

In literature, as in politics, it is important to take into account that pacifism and the struggle for peace are not one and the same. Pacifism is, if it is possible to say, a politically vegetarian tendency, although nonetheless pacifism in a limited sense is our ally. But this does not at all mean that pacifism is a position of communists. Pacifism places us in the same ranks with those who block our peaceful initiatives and, as before, place a great stake on force. One small example shows to what specifically the pacifist position can lead.

Last month, in one of the Moscow weeklies, a well-respected author and writer published in his reflections approximately such a dialogue.

The writer, according to his words, had a conversation with the commander of a Soviet nuclear submarine (anonymous, I think, because such a commander of a Soviet nuclear submarine does not exist). The essence of this dialogue was as follows: [paragraph continues]

The writer said to the officer: Imagine that our country had been turned into an asphalt desert as a result of a U.S. nuclear first strike, as foreseen in their doctrine. But you were able to receive the signal, the order, to deliver a retaliatory strike. Would you deliver such a strike? The ship commander, after thinking a while, asked the writer, "What about you? Would you press the button?" The writer categorically and simply answered, "No." Then, according to the writer, the ship commander began to doubt, and did not give a definite answer.

Of course, the writer's position is a matter of his conscience. But we would like it if, when people write about such extraordinarily serious matters, they would somewhat represent the realities, those terrible imperatives which we face today.

Now, while your plenum is taking place, thousands, tens of thousands of people are located in military missile sites, on military duty and nuclear submarines are located in the far reaches of the world ocean; for days, people do not see the stars or the sky or the eyes of the universe except to be prepared for a retaliatory strike. But I especially want to emphasize that we want, we believe, we hope that this need for a retaliatory strike will never occur, will not be required. That the reason of our antipode will not tolerate a first strike. However, it is namely our readiness for an answering strike that is the factor of fateful significance. Since a political mechanism for stopping war has not created (not through our fault) we must keep the military mechanism in a state of readiness. This is also a real imperative of the times.

Incidentally, the position of this author is not original. Already 20 years ago in West Germany the so-called "nuclear pacifists" appeared, the essence of whose views was support for unilateral disarmament. But it is characteristic that usually these social activists themselves hardly believed in the possibility of unilateral disarmament. They rarely turned to the Americans, to overseas, because they knew that the answer there would only be the same.

Still, from these "avoiders", if it can be said, comes a one-sided understanding of the imperatives of the nuclear age. Now it has become unfashionable to discuss the "image of the enemy". For instance, in peace time, even in army propaganda, this term is not used. Never. In one respected weekly a discussion was published, and the editor of this journal, a popular journal, stated that in moments of international antagonism or increasing tensions, the editorial board was literally swamped with letters, caricatures, demands for people to display vigilance, watchfulness, etc. I would have like to warn people about this, the editor stated. In fact, he is warning the Soviet people about a completely understandable watchfulness in relation to forces which (many times) confirmed their aggressiveness. I think these warnings are at the very least irrelevant.

I do not want to go into excessive detail on this question, but I would like once more to remind you that, while struggling for strengthening peace, we are obliged to remain on the alert! Such is the severe logic of the nuclear age.

With deep regret, I want to say that for many writers the problem of military-patriotic themes stands somewhere in second or third place. They sometimes say that a military-patriotic theme is bureaucratic, almost second-class literature. But this is simply a misunderstanding of those severe imperatives and real contradictions of the nuclear age, about which we are speaking today.

In conclusion, I would like to say that in the world only change is eternal. We believe that under the winds of historical change even the current military-political situation in the world will change for the better. We do not simply believe this or hope for this. For this--there are many arguments of our dynamic reality.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522 .

USSR: 'ILLUSIONS' IN NUCLEAR AGE MILITARY THINKING

PM291311 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 May 87 First Edition pp 2-3

[Article by Professor Colonel General D. Volkogonov, doctor of philosophical sciences: "Imperatives of the Nuclear Age"]

[Text] For many centuries, climbing the endless steps of the pyramid of social progress, a sinister train of innumerable wars trailed behind human civilization. History has known 7- and 30-year wars and even a 100-year war. In the 20th century, two world wars and hundreds of local wars have left indelible scars on the face of the planet, carrying off tens of millions of human lives. But in terms of their catastrophic consequences, all these wars pale in comparison with the threat of an unthinkable but possible nuclear war.

The fateful sequence of these wars and the Damoclean threat of an incinerating nuclear cataclysm have posed with the utmost acuteness and terrible definiteness the question: How is peace to be preserved and strengthened? How is it possible to create a political mechanism to block the source of war through the efforts of those on earth without waiving principles or social and spiritual values? As is known, the answers to these questions are contained in the concept of new political thinking. This concept, developed in the 27th party congress decisions, has made principled amendments to the correlation between war and politics. The new political thinking is not a new world outlook, but a new facet of it which enriches us with understanding of the commanding imperatives (objective demands) of the nuclear age. The concept of new thinking does not go against Leninist teaching on the defense of the socialist homeland. It is important to emphasize this, for articles have appeared recently in our press which, in our opinion, misinterpret the phenomenon of war, the military-political situation, and the social role of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Destiny of War [subhead]

All countries have many monuments devoted to war: to military leaders, heroes, battles. There are no monuments to peace in the true sense of the world. Not only because the best "monuments" to peace are created by people in the form of palaces, dams, roads, and other manifestations of the creative power of human reason, but also because peace has been a rare guest on earth. The flames of war are blazing somewhere virtually always, giving people an awful reminder of its merciless millstones grinding the destinies of a multitude of people.

Humanists, thinkers, and politicians of the past tried to create some obstacles in the way of the chariot of war. In his essay, the enlightener Grotius (1625) urged Christians to resolve disputes carrying a threat of war at special interstate gatherings. I. Kant, the great 18th-century thinker, suspected that military conflicts could be doused if "stable equilibrium" were created. In the course of technical progress and with the emergence of new weapons there were attempts to limit their application. Thus, an appeal was heard at the 1215 Church Synod for a ban on crossbows; the question of a ban on case shot was discussed at the height of the Napoleonic wars; the Hague conventions of 1899 and 1907 prohibited "the dropping of lethal objects from aircraft and the bombing of cities." As long ago as 1930 the League of Nations resolved to destroy all stocks of chemical and bacteriological weapons...

It is known, the bans were not implemented. In particular, because neither case shot nor the "dropping" of lethal objects from aircraft threatened to destroy all mankind.

A fundamentally new situation has arisen in the final quarter of the 20th century. The achievements of human genius, placed at the service of militarism, have created a threat to the existence of human civilization. Nuclear weapons have "outgrown" the purposes for which they were created. The qualitatively new level of development of military hardware has put the destiny of war itself onto a new plane. At a certain stage (and mankind has evidently reached it) there is a boundary, a limit to war. A boundary in the sense that in the modern epoch nuclear war, if we speak of its functional aspect, cannot be a sensible, rational means of policy. Otherwise, as M.S. Gorbachev pointed out in his speech at the forum of peace-loving forces on 16 February this year, "the authors of such a policy will themselves be consumed in a nuclear war." It has become obvious, if you define the genesis and essence of the unthinkable but possible nuclear war, that henceforth it is possible to continue with its help only a crazy, criminal, adventurist policy leading to nonexistence. However, it seems that this is precisely what the militarist wing of modern imperialism adheres to, reckoning on achieving decisive strategic superiority over socialism with the help of new military programs. We have to take the chimeras of such adventurist thinking into account.

Unfortunately, individual authors concentrate their efforts only on condemning war "in general" and on painting a vivid picture of its apocalyptic consequences without clearly indicating the impact of that global threat. The damning of nuclear weapons outside a political context is also aimless. How, for example, can one evaluate the printed statement by the well-known Soviet writer A. Adamovich, who regards as the duty of literature to "create a moral atmosphere in society, in the world, on the planet, such that it would not be prestigious to have the bomb and no less shameful than concentration camps, death factories, and Auschwitzes are today"?! Here the author says that for the opposing systems to "cease to be mutually threatening" we must start with ourselves. But did we not start struggling for peace as long ago as 1917? As though the famous Soviet plan for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons from the planet by the threshold of the next millennium did not and does not exist! If we follow the writer's logic, only unilateral disarmament (for the West is still not taking steps toward us) can release us from the "shame" of possessing nuclear weapons.

The dialectics of war and peace involve a struggle between two opposites, whose positive resolution is possible only in the sphere of politics. K. Marx was profoundly right when he once emphasized that "war attained developed forms earlier than peace." Countless numbers of folios and treatises have been written on war, and pieces of research carried out. Considerably less has been said about peace. As a state of relations between states, peace exists on different levels in real life: the levels of friendship and cooperation, peaceful coexistence, and "cold war."

The socialist countries are the most consistent expressers of the policy of peace. They have no classes or social groups with an interest in using military violence as a means of solving international problems. Our country personifies the most consistent adherent of peace. As long ago as the dawn of the formation of the Soviet state, V.I. Lenin evaluated the Great October Socialist Revolution, whose 70th anniversary will be celebrated by all progressive mankind this year, as "the first victory for the cause of destroying wars." Today the USSR adheres to an exceptionally clear and precise concept: The immediate task is that of weakening the threat of nuclear war; the next is that of making still more remote the likelihood of one breaking out; and, finally, the ultimate task is that of excluding nuclear war from the life of society. Precisely this could be (and must be!) the evolution of the destiny of war.

But, for the time being, a nuclear world is the awful imperative of contemporary existence. Today our class opponent is still not agreeable to living in a different, nonnuclear world. Therefore, just as it is impossible to applaud with one hand, so it is also impossible to create a nuclear-free world through unilateral efforts alone.

Whether we want this or not, we cannot fail to take this reality into account. Unfortunately, claims are made, as one Soviet author writes, for example, that there will not be peace as long as "each social system insists on its own 'favorite ideas.'" That is, the possibility of preserving peace is virtually dependent on the abandonment of one's ideals and spiritual values. The inadmissibility of such an approach is obvious. Our class approach to peace does not contradict what is common to all mankind. Moreover, the dialectics of the class aspect and the general human aspect in the fundamental question of today are now manifested in the merging of the profound interests of the overwhelming majority of the planet and the socialist world. The conclusion which V.I. Lenin drew as long ago as March 1920 — "... Our peaceful policy is approved by the vast majority of the world's population" — still retains its full force today. It is difficult to understand the author who writes that "common philosophical ground" is needed to build a demilitarized world. The outlooks of the two worlds will remain different. But this does not, however, rule out the possibility of formulating a unified view of nuclear war as an inadmissible means in politics — not just a view, but also real actions aimed at excluding nuclear war from the life of human society. For the time being, only socialism is ready for this. That is the whole point.

Logic of Balance [subhead]

The imperatives of the nuclear age are commanding. They have left their mark on many things: the correlation of forces, modern strategy, priorities of values, future prospects. It is precisely the new realities of our times that have brought to life the new thinking, which is steadily becoming established in the consciousness of more and more people. However, the impression is sometimes gained that the consciousness of those who control the giant U.S. and NATO war machine is in mothballs, as it were. The strong public movements in defense of civilization, the socialist countries' numerous initiatives, and the doubts arising among their own people as to the rightness of power politics "flow round," as it were, and bypass the reason and feelings of such diehards as Caspar Weinberger, for example.

In the book "Nuclear Forces," K. Payne, one of the Pentagon's nuclear planners, argues frankly and cynically: "Despite everything, the United States must plan for victory over the USSR at a price which will enable Americans to survive." And it is planning. More than 40,000 targets, which are kept "in the sights" of the triad of offensive nuclear forces, are marked on USSR territory on the Pentagon's unified, integrated operations map. The preamble to the "Directives on Building the U.S. Armed Forces" states: "In a nuclear war, the United States must gain the upper hand and be able to force the USSR to quickly cease hostilities on terms favorable to us." The document's contents confirm yet again the offensive thrust of U.S. military doctrine, which allows the possibility of destroying its opponent while itself surviving. Such is the reality.

Soviet military doctrine, as a system of state views on military building and on the preparation of the country and its Armed Forces to repulse aggression, is of a strictly defensive nature. It has essentially become a doctrine of preventing war. This finds expression in the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons nor to seek one-sided military advantages and in the readiness to undertake the phased mutual destruction of the nuclear arsenal. The Soviet Union's attainment of parity with the United States was a phenomenon of a special order, because it put the potential aggressor in a position where it could not count on victory. While remaining a military means, nuclear weapons are increasingly becoming an instrument which it would be irrational to use. Our ability to maintain the existing parity and balance deters those people in the Pentagon's bunkers who are still seeking in vain ways to achieve victory.

For us, the phenomenon of nuclear confrontation is strictly a phenomenon forced upon us as a method, a response to dreadful challenges. We are ready, as the 27th CPSU Congress emphasized, proceeding from the principle of equal security and given reliable international verification, to move from the present level of nuclear confrontation to the lowest, right down to the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

For the other side, as is shown by the recent visits by eminent guests from Britain and France, as well as by the obvious concurrence in this question of their chief ally on the other side of the ocean, nuclear deterrence is a conceptual, strategic principle.

Therefore, it is hardly correct to examine this process in a nondifferentiated way, as many authors do. For it is a double-sided process: for one side -- a process forced upon it; for the other -- a process with specific objectives [tselepolagayushchiy].

It is only with the help of parity, which the 27th CPSU Congress evaluated as "socialism's historic achievement," that we deter the potential aggressor from taking foolhardy steps. However, placed by the very logic of historical confrontation under conditions where we possess corresponding might, the U.S. and NATO leaders are doing everything to "circumvent," make worthless, and upset the present balance. The whole point is that we want peace without military victory, while the NATO West wants its victory without fail with the help of war or peace (American-style).

The impression is sometimes formed that what Washington understands by foreign policy is just a state of affairs in which one side will be bound to lose and the other to win. But peace is a goal which can only be attained in association. In the face of the nuclear threat everything must be done to ensure that the gain and the victory are the same -- true, just peace. But this does not seem to suit those who are now on the hill of power in Washington and in other NATO capitals. The pooling of the sides' efforts in the struggle for mankind's survival can only be achieved on the basis of

compromises, mutual concessions, and steps toward each other, not by abandoning one's principles and ideals. This is why the arguments about peace which are encountered and which do not take account of the actually aggressive efforts of Atlanticists and the militarist military seem strange. Only practical recognition of the principle of equal security provides opportunities for the possibility of an agreement, the possibility of movement toward lasting peace. Such is the logic of balance.

The UNESCO Charter contains a noteworthy sentence: "Thoughts of war arise in people's minds, and so the idea of defending peace must be implemented in people's consciousness." But, in implanting this idea, we must not forget where the source of the wars of modern times lies, who is opposed to the numerous peace initiatives of the USSR and its allies, who needs concepts like SDI, and why. Perhaps human consciousness needs to become global, common, and unified with regard to war, peace, and the future. Through Hamlet's lips Shakespeare pronounced an eternal philosophical question: "To be or not to be?" But Hamlet was thinking of just one person. All mankind must become aware of this question: The problem of survival has become global. The fact that we realized this before our class opponent attests to the more profound humanist basis for the new thinking in our minds. We understand that military-strategic parity is knot spiritual parity. We have had and continue to have an incontestable advantage in this sphere. It consists in our invincible aspiration for peace, the humanism of our communist ideals and goals, and our readiness and ability to defend our spiritual values. In this light, future historians will be able to describe as a colossal success the prevention of the catastrophe that we will not allow to happen.

Arguments of Existence

You could say that there exists today a range of several basic possibilities for the development of civilization: peaceful coexistence, brinkmanship, or nuclear apocalypse. Which of these possibilities is realized depends, of course, not only on the people in the Pentagon bunkers; today it is obvious that the solution to the fateful dilemma is determined to a greater degree by those who personify the denial of war as a means of resolving the chief contradiction of the epoch. this is the indisputable argument of our existence. The fact that such an unstable, fragile peace, such as it is today, has been preserved is to a large degree a result of the political will of socialism, its economic might, and the combat potential of its armed forces.

This fact shows the distinctive dialectic of the social role of the armed forces. Having been an instrument of violence and war throughout the history of human civilization (and they remain this under capitalism), under the conditions of socialism, they have been transformed into an instrument of peace. But if the authors of the concepts of "massive retaliation," "flexible response," and "Star Wars" were one day to cross the Rubicon dividing peace and war and proceed to monstrous actions, the Soviet soldiers and officers in charge of the strategic might would be forced to fulfill their duty to the end. This is prescribed by the provisions of our military doctrine.

Unfortunately, certain authors cast doubt on the competence of this concept. For example, the writer whom we mentioned at the beginning of the article considers such an approach absurd and ridiculous. He says that for him "today there are no military men braver or worthier than those who, like retired generals, devote their military knowledge to the antiwar movement." The writer unequivocally believes that there must be no counterstrike. By his arguments he essentially leads the reader toward this thought: Since even a counterstrike is senseless, is readiness necessary?

This is not an original viewpoint. So-called "nuclear pacifists," primarily people of a religious circle, maintain that it is immoral to use nuclear weapons even for purposes of self-defense or retaliation. But it is very characteristic that the purveyors of such views usually turn only to the Soviet Union in the belief that the West will not take any unilateral steps.

The Soviet writer's aforementioned views are a matter for his conscience. However, we cannot overlook the fact that he virtually casts doubt on the expediency of Soviet servicemen fulfilling their military duty; this is no longer a harmless rhetorical exercise.

Thousands of Soviet servicemen enter onto combat duty at missile complexes every day. They are directly involved in tasks of strategic and, I would say, fateful significance. We all hope and believe that none of them will ever have to carry out an order to launch against real targets. But the readiness to do so, as the highest expression of one's military and civic duty, still remains a formidable deterrent factor. Until a political mechanism for blocking war has been created, there exists one indisputable truth for Soviet servicemen in the form of an axiom: The greater our combat readiness, the less the likelihood of a potential aggressor undertaking a nuclear adventure. This is one more argument of the nuclear age.

Unfortunately, articles by certain authors without clear class positions are not rare. Here I will make the reservation that we do not see abstract pacificism as an ideological "foe"; rather, the reverse. Nor must we feel to shy to say that such pacificism is not the position of Communists.

Otherwise, whether we want to or not, we must share equally the responsibility for the Damoclean threat of the nuclear apocalypse hanging over us with those who are preparing it, for the fact that there is no way the world will see progress toward security, and for the fact that the West is not ready to live in a nuclear-free world. Yet in all instances we have been and are the first to take a step toward a secure world. Can this really be ignored?

Since we cannot dispense with our defensive might, nor can we underestimate the fostering of readiness to defend socialism in the Soviet people. This is not only a sacred duty, but also a profound, vital necessity. The conclusions of scientists published in a popular newspaper appear false in this light. Abstracted from social, demographic, and other factors, the drafting of students for military service in full accordance with our laws is qualified as a "foolish and shortsighted" solution. It is said that "atrophy and numbing of creative abilities" take place during service. One of the participants in a roundtable in the newspaper in fact poses an inadmissible question: Whom does our society need more: soldiers or learned specialists? If this is a problem for the scientist in question, that is not so serious. But how does such a contrast make it possible to understand the social role of military service? Particularly in the light of present realities?

The readiness to fulfill one's constitutional duty is inseparable from vigilance. No, not from suspicion, but from a genuine class guardedness toward those who are accelerating the "Star Wars" plans and placing more and more new models of refined weapons onto the endless conveyor belt of the arms race, who drew up the Charioteer, Dropshot, and Trojan plans for a preventive attack on the USSR, and who are now preparing models and scenarios for a nuclear blitzkrieg. Therefore, it is distressing that in discussing the topic of the "image of the enemy" (incidentally, this term is

not used in peacetime in our propaganda, even military propaganda), conclusions are drawn which do not take reality into account. For example, the record of a discussion on this topic conducted in one journal and the statements by a number of participants contained thoughts with which it is hard to agree. In particular, one of the participants maintained that "at times of drops in political temperature, the editorial office is inundated not with analytical articles, but with readers' letters and cartoons. These materials frequently border literally on combat, front-line propaganda. This is what I would like to warn against." The speaker willy-nilly "warns" Soviet people against displaying vigilance, a direct class response, and guardedness. He "warns" Soviet people who have more than enough grounds for making a sober judgement of the intentions and affairs of imperialist circles.

Realities do not accept illusions. Lenin's words remain topical: "Whoever thought that peace can be achieved easily, that we have only to mention peace in passing and the bourgeoisie will hand it to us on a plate, is quite naive."

The concept of new thinking does not ignore the new realities, but, on the contrary, takes them most fully into account. We cannot reckon that, if we close our eyes to the appearance of those who continue to seek the elusive specter of victory in nuclear war, they will change from that and become different. Regard for this imperative of the nuclear age is not a manifestation of being a "diehard," but a sober assessment of the political situation which can (and must!) change for the better amid the wind of historic changes. We do not simply believe in this; many arguments of today's dynamic existence are in favor of this truth.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN LINKS SCIENCES, NEW THINKING, 'GLASNOST'

WA011500 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 18, 11 May 87 pp 18-21

[Academician Vitaliy Goldanskiy article in "Reflexivus" column: "Science and New Thinking"]

[Text] It is common knowledge that in the context of the mid-20th-century scientific and technological revolution science possesses a colossal potential for both construction and destruction. Everything depends on how science is used. But if only a few decades ago it was regarded with respect bordering on awe, if many saw it as something of a panacea for the ills besetting mankind, today the opposite view -- that science is the source of all evil -- is becoming more and more prevalent.

Indeed, we are witnessing scientific achievements that have radically affected the conditions of human existence, all aspects of our life (material and hence spiritual). Here I would like to underscore that not enough light has been thrown on the important contribution modern science, scientific and technological progress is making to the theoretical substantiation of the new thinking that is asserting itself in both the foreign policy (avenues to a nuclear-free world) and the domestic policy (democratization and openness) of the CPSU and our country. In other words, the new thinking is pivoted not on illusory notions, it is dictated not by arbitrariness, but by a strictly scientific, realistic approach to the conditions of human existence today, by a thorough appraisal of all the factors of scientific and technological progress. It is a concrete, theoretically substantiated policy, the product of the present stage in the development of society, science and technology.

Nuclear super-armament has brought the world to the dangerous point where the very existence of humanity is threatened. It has become clear that with the nuclear weaponry accumulated to date, any global war, should it break out, would inevitably develop into a nuclear war. Even an "ordinary" armed conflict in this age of nuclear power production could lead to massive casualties through radiation caused by the damage done to nuclear reactors.

Extremely rapid is the development of devices for keeping track of everything that is being done on our planet (and often also underwater or underground) from outer space by means of spy satellites equipped with all manner of sensors. The earth, our common home, is thus wide open to surveillance by an all-seeing eye looking down from space. For instance, figures on licence plates are clearly visible on photographs taken from an altitude of hundreds of kilometres. At the same time, mastery of outer space and possession of the latest means of surveillance, in a word, the level attained by

information science, have afforded radically new opportunities for the strictest mutual verification of the observance of all international agreements. Such verification can and should be the guarantee of the establishment of mutual trust, a reliable obstacle to the drifting of humanity not only to nuclear war but to wars fought with conventional armaments. In the present conditions created by scientific and technological progress any repetition of what happened on June 22, 1941, when the colossal nazi war machine suddenly pounced on our country, is totally excluded.

Under the impact of scientific and technological progress on international politics, the dogmatic assertion that a nuclear holocaust can bring victory (or defeat) to one or another social system has given way to the realization that in a nuclear war there can be no victors. People are coming to see that nuclear war is tantamount to the self-destruction of human civilization. Lenin's thesis that human values take priority over the objectives of one or another class has found new emphatic confirmation. Hence the totally new approach to foreign policy issues that is reflected in many of our programme documents.

But if realization of the implications of such factors as nuclear super-armament and the possibility of comprehensive verification argues in favour of Soviet foreign policy, of our programme of "disarmament for development" (the antipode of "armament instead of development"), the extraordinary progress in information science and computerization, in the means of global communication and the extensive use of outer space has logically led to another, internal political aspect of the new thinking. It offers further scientific confirmation of the need for democratization and openness which naturally follow from Marxism, the only possible and rational foundation of socialist society.

Being a stimulator and the material basis of democratization and openness, the scientific and technological revolution brings out in still bolder relief the advantages of socialism. Let us examine this more closely in the light primarily of the specific character and tasks of science.

What, it may be asked, is the most characteristic feature of our time -- this time of unprecedented progress in electronics, computerization, space exploration and rapid advance of science in general?

Above all, there is the ever-mounting influx of information, its increasing range, volume and the speed of disseminating, the sophistication of the means of data recording, storing and transfer. Take, for instance, such basic features of modern computers and other data systems as memory and speed (already in the offing are ultra-modern molecular computers, which will break all records for concentration of information per unit of volume), the ever-increasing quantity of information sources -- periodicals, books and scientific articles. Terms like "indexing," "key words," "automated data-processing" are becoming more and more common.

The advent of diverse data banks with automated inlet and outlet terminals marks a breakthrough in international information and communication. International radio broadcasting is gradually being relegated to the background by international space television. More and more widely used (so far mainly in the West) are personal computers. Distinguished by their data storage capacity and versatility, they are -- and this is of no little importance -- becoming data duplicators as well. Colossal as it is, their memory keeps expanding, the network of their links with other data banks is becoming increasingly ramified and intricate. Computer languages, such as Algol and Fortran, are developing into a sort of latter-day Esperanto.

Worldwide radio and television transmission in these machine languages, their reception by personal computers and programmed data processing are undoubtedly a matter of the foreseeable future.

Whether this is "good" or "bad," whether we should praise or blame science for all this is beside the point. All this is a fact of life, an inseparable feature of our time, the time we live in, a reality that has to be reckoned with, by which we have to be guided if we are not to lag hopelessly behind the times not only technically but also in our thinking.

And here, in my view, it is necessary to make full use of that vast potential of socialist society which for so many years was virtually forgotten and which now has been brought to the fore -- democratization and openness.

There are, then, two options. On the one hand, democratization and openness, and on the other, walling oneself off from information, wearing blinkers, building bigger, thicker, higher fences. Clearly, only the first of these alternatives, the one the Party is advocating, is in step with scientific and technological progress, moreover is

Based on that progress, and gives maximum impetus to further advance of science and technology whereas the latter is an impediment to, a brake on progress.

In socialist society, people must be well-informed, must have the maximum information at their disposal. This thesis is based on deep faith in the unlimited opportunities socialist society affords for the flowering of the human personality. Otherwise propaganda threatens to become inept and dull, invariably belated, its arguments threadbare and outdated, designed to combat not the real, strong opponent but a mythical dull-witted adversary, and as often as not, with the exclusion of the strongest and most incisive facts from our own arsenal, facts which for one reason or another the pseudo-propagandist prefers to conceal.

Openness plays an enormous role also in ensuring an effective feedback in terms of truly scientific sociological analysis of the response, the reaction of the people to the initiatives of the Party and the government, to world developments. What we need is not nebulous wishful thinking, not the thunderous echoes of self-congratulatory exhortations and success-reports, but honest, objective and impartial analysis of everything that is happening around us.

"Our strength," Lenin said, "lies in stating the truth!" It is this conviction that enabled us to admit openly and honestly from the rostrum of a recent plenary meeting of the Central Committee that "serious shortcomings in ideological and political educational work were in many cases covered up by the staging of showy campaigns and events, by numerous jubilee celebrations both in the centre and in the localities" with the result that "the world of everyday realities and the world of ostentatious well-being moved farther and farther apart."

It is precisely because our restructuring is based on a strictly scientific foundation and not on mere whim, because it is a clear-cut, theoretically substantiated programme of action that it causes undisguised alarm among anti-Soviet circles in the West. The policy of democratization and openness has knocked the ground from under the feet of the diverse radio "voices" and press hacks. They have been left with nothing but futile crystal gazing. The most sensational cooked-up "facts," often accompanied by

fantastic commentaries, cannot interest readers and listeners nearly as much as the true picture of life in our country, of the people and the world at large presented by our journals, newspapers, radio and television programmes. That is why the purveyors of anti-Soviet propaganda are far more anxious than anyone else to undermine the Party's policy of democratization and openness, to halt, retard, reverse the process of renewal. They are seriously alarmed at the sharp decline, despite the fact that the BBC is no longer jammed, in the number of listeners to the various "voices." Why spend money on jamming when openness has proved much more effective.

Today there is a clearly defined demarcation line between those who welcome our reforms, who are interested in strengthening relations with our country and in building world peace and those who would like to exhaust the U.S.S.R. economically, through the arms race in the hope of compelling us to take steps damaging to the economy and to the constructive tasks of building socialism. The restructuring has become something of a touchstone also for former Soviet citizens who have chosen to leave their native land. The renewal in our country is opposed (not surprisingly) both by the so-called "conservatives" among them, the votaries of the old order, and by those who until recently posed as ultra-innovators. Both categories are now bringing grist to one and the same mill.

Incidentally, lack of information played into the hands of the foreign purveyors of using propaganda. No small role was played here also by the striving inherent in the bureaucratic mentality to grow as many forbidden fruits as possible. One cannot but recall in this connection the excellent definition of bureaucracy given at the beginning of this century by the German Chancellor Prince von Bulow. "Bureaucracy," he wrote, "is always behind with needed reforms, is distinguished by the extreme constant tendency to interfere in the personal lives of citizens. By its policy of pinpricks it only irritates the population to no purpose and creates the soil for opposition."

Nothing can be more instructive for those who drool with pleasure at the thought of the West than to see with their own eyes the foreign lands "flowing with milk and honey" and to experience themselves the much-vaunted "freedoms" and the crime, unemployment and social inequality that are rife in their shadow. As for those who are aching to leave their native land, it is probably time to say "good riddance." And to advise them, before they go, to take another look at the American TV film about Soviet citizens shown recently on Soviet television.

A few words about history. It seems to me that our historical science lags far behind literature and the arts in depicting the heroic and tragic pages in the history of our country and our Party. History cannot be seriously studied or taught without access to original source material. I have always been keenly interested in history, and indeed I wanted to become a historian. Knowing this, an American colleague of mine once presented me with a book entitled "Page One," a collection of facsimile reproductions of the most important front pages of THE NEW YORK TIMES for the years 1920-75. A fascinating and instructive book! It clearly revealed, for instance, how disproportionately little coverage was given in the United States to the decisive contribution made by the Soviet armed forces to the defeat of nazi Germany. Would it not be in place for us to have a similar book?

The files of many of our newspapers and journals are well-nigh crumbling with age, and libraries are now reluctant to lend them out. Here is where a book like "Page One" would come in very handy. The stenographic reports of congresses, too, are not easily available. It is difficult to overestimate the tremendous educational value these living pages of history could have for the youth. And how instructive a warning would be the republication of the stenographic record of the August 1948 session of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Agriculture Sciences which branded genetics as a "pseudoscience" and set the development of Soviet biology back decades.

But to return from history to the events of the past year. There are some "know-alls" who keep count of all its disasters -- Chernobyl and the Admiral Nakhimov, the loss of the atomic submarine, the coal mine explosion, and the avalanches -- and see them as proof that if anything has changed in our country it is for the worse. No, it is not that there are more disasters, but that there is more honest and frank information about them and, had there been such openness before, there would be less negligence and fewer disasters today.

Unfortunately, we did not give enough thought to the great harm wrought by the habitual absence of openness. Until recently, we never carried reports of preparations for our space flights (apart from the international ones), although such preparations are clearly visible from outer space. Our seismological stations never included in the list of their observations the underground testing of nuclear weapons in the U.S.S.R. (which were reported by the seismological stations of other countries), and this gave us, the present writer included, no little trouble during discussions of the problem of the total banning of nuclear testing at various international meetings. Today, after the more than 18 months of the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear testing -- that striking manifestation of our new thinking -- and after the joint Soviet-American seismic experiment in the area of our testing ground near Semipalatinsk, the voices of our ill-wishers have fallen silent. One more proof that openness is a powerful factor making for a healthier international climate.

The policy of democratization and openness, proclaimed by the 27th Congress of the CPSU and emphatically confirmed by the January (1987) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee as the cardinal element of restructuring and renewal, is firmly based not only on the fundamental principles of socialist society, but also on analysis of the basic trends of scientific and technological progress.

The active builder of our future cannot but be conscious of the identity of his own interests with the interests of the socialist homeland, its welfare and prosperity, be it a matter of the national economy or the environment, history or cultural monuments. At the same time, he must think independently, be able to tell what is in question -- just one more "order" from above or the supreme interests of the country. It is of the utmost importance that Soviet people be fully informed, that they be supplied with the maximum information systematized and thoroughly analyzed. And when people come to realize that it is precisely science that has fully substantiated the vital need both for a nuclear-free world and for a socialist society built on the principles of democratization and openness, restructuring and renewal, then -- I am firmly convinced! -- there will be not the slightest room for even a shadow of doubt as to whether science is a blessing or a disaster for humanity.

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: U.S. OPINION SEEN FAVORING AGREEMENT WITH SOVIETS

PM031031 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Anatoliy A. Gromyko, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Signs of Change? On How the New Political Thinking Is Being Affirmed in the United States"]

[Text] San Francisco-Washington-Moscow -- The wind of change for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations is strengthening in the United States. True, at the present it is felt not so much in government corridors of power as in broad circles of U.S. society. In order not to make unsubstantiated statements about its elite, I will mention that when I met U.S. financial tycoon George Sores [name as published] in New York, he expressed a desire to set up a philanthropic foundation which would operate on the basis of Soviet laws (!) and would facilitate the development of cultural and scientific links between the United States and the USSR. With this in view, Sores is ready to donate \$1 million as a start.

The wind of detente is also penetrating the mass media, arousing confusion among venerable Sovietologists and anti-Sovietists. They do in fact have reason to clutch their heads. For to the question: "Can the Russians be trusted?" -- to their amazement, increasingly large numbers of Americans are answering: "Yes"! Here is just one example. In April this year PEOPLE magazine published on the whole quite a good piece about the life of Soviet people. The majority of Americans were delighted at such boldness on the part of the publishers. Bradley Odett from Maine expressed his approval as follows in a letter to the magazine's editorial office: "Once again I saw that people are people, irrespective of their political ideologies. With two such similar nations, nowadays peace for all time seems quite possible." Carmen Volkansik from Texas writes: "I applaud your efforts to tell us about the faces and hearts of these people. If we agree that our political ideologies are different and do not try to change one another, we will then, as people, be able to be friends."

The question "Can the Americans be trusted?" naturally perturbed U.S. representatives of the Committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat, invited to California by the U.S. organization "World Without War." And our impressions from meetings with them in California and Washington, at the Federation of American Scientists and the U.S. National Academy of Sciences would have to be summed up with the word: "Yes"! They are for the most part normal, amiable people. As a people, the Americans undoubtedly deserve respect. On the other hand there are still many of them who have a very distorted impression of the Soviet Union and our people. And this is not surprising. For the image of the "Soviet enemy" is foisted upon the

average American every day, and I would even say every hour. For example, U.S. television regularly shows cheap anti-Soviet movies. The cost of this massive attack in terms of the common sense of many Americans is distressingly obvious. I will illustrate this with an example. On the morning of 5 May Peter Ustinov, the famous actor and participant in the Moscow forum "For a Nuclear-Free World, for the Survival of Humanity," appeared on U.S. television (ABC). He talked about the great changes in the USSR and called for the normalization of Soviet-American relations. "Have you been brainwashed?" the moderator asked him. "Because in our country we think that they cannot be trusted, whatever they say!" "Have I been brainwashed?" Ustinov said in amazement. He went on to rightly remark that the Americans who never travel anywhere, know little, and read the same newspaper are the ones who are brainwashed.

Nonetheless, through the dense wall of weeds and numerous cliches about the "aggressive Soviets," the new thinking in the nuclear age is breaking through among the inhabitants of two-story America -- and it is precisely in such houses that the great majority of Americans live. [paragraph continues]

They are so drawn toward it that people in official Washington are seriously concerned. For the U.S. presidential election campaign is already sweeping the U.S. political elite. In a year and a half Reagan goes. Who will take his place? What political platform will the candidates run for election on? Will they once again eulogize the arms race and shrill demonic accusations at the "evil empire"? That is the old decrepit platform. Will it succeed again in the exhausting election struggle? Or perhaps it is necessary to demonstrate state wisdom and stop dividing people into Muscovite "devils" and Washington "angels"?

Of course these are not the only questions filling U.S. politicians' heads today. Nonetheless, I don't think I will be wrong if I say that never before has such great interest in building normal Soviet-U.S. relations been observed among ordinary Americans. It is true that there is also great opposition to it. The conglomerate of anti-Soviet forces in the United States is continuing to endeavor to blacken the very idea of the possibility of Soviet-U.S. accords on the most important problems of war and peace. The military-industrial complex, the ultraconservatives, and the foreign policy dogmatists -- and there are plenty of such people in the United States -- have all launched into new anti-Soviet provocations -- for example, spy mania. They foster hostility toward the Soviet Union as much as they can. The journalist Norman Podhoretz, for example, went so far as to claim that history will show that the reforms being carried out in the USSR dimension will "result in aggression abroad."

These circles consider that confrontation in relations with the USSR must be the leitmotiv of U.S. foreign policy. But their positions are no longer as firm as they were during the first 6 years of the Reagan Presidency.

The United States in April-May 1987 is at a stage of ferment and quest for a renewed basis for its foreign policy. The powerful impulses of the new political thinking and the restructuring and democratization of socialist society in the USSR are acting as a marked catalyst for common sense in the Americans' approach to our country.

...Theodore Taylor from Mayland, a major U.S. scientist and physicist, made, as he himself says, an appreciable contribution in the past to developing U.S. nuclear programs. We talked with him in a sunny glade at the U.S. "House of Scientists," so to speak, in the small town of Airrie. Here in the Washington suburbs where "brainstorming sessions" to seek solutions to problems of peace and disarmament are

regularly held, Taylor says with conviction: "The survival of civilization depends on whether we can control the arms race and engage in cooperation between states, especially between the United States and the USSR. Such cooperation will pose a threat to no one and will benefit everyone."

Another very well known U.S. physicist, Professor Frank von Hippel of Princeton University, joined in the conversation. "Who are we? Where are we going?" he asked. And he gave the answer himself. "The United States, like the Soviet Union, is experiencing a difficult period of transition from old to new thinking. Here in our country, the old thinking appears stronger, since many of our government officials represent it and do not fully understand the realities of the nuclear age. The new thinking conforms with these realities and cannot be denied."

I started to tell Frank about the Soviet leadership's recent foreign policy initiatives. I felt that he was very familiar with them. The destinies of the United States and the USSR, Von Hippel considers, are closely linked. "When, under Mikhail Gorbachev's leadership," he says, "the new thinking is transformed into actions, it is thereby also reinforced in the West. [paragraph continues]"

"Many of us understand that reactions in the West to the processes now taking place in your country can both strengthen and weaken the new thinking in the USSR. Therefore we are working particularly hard to ensure that the West reacts positively to the historic opportunities which are now opening up."

The conversation with Taylor and Von Hippel was not an exception. For example, I spoke with Gordon Thompson, director of the Institute of Security Resources and Problems in Massachusetts. He said with conviction: "Our countries have fallen into the trap of dangerous nuclear confrontation, which diverts our attention from pressing problems influencing the fate of all mankind. The time has come for us to solve these problems together with you, and maybe our mutual fears will disappear during this process. For example, through joint efforts both our countries could supply all Africa with drinking water by the year 2000." Agreeing with the American, I could not help thinking that the Soviet Union has already essentially proposed a real way to resolve similar large-scale international problems in putting forward the program to destroy all nuclear weapons by the year 2000. During the course of its implementation opportunities would also naturally arise to implement a "Disarmament for Development" action program. Without the former the latter essentially cannot occur in the "Third World." And without considerable financial and economic aid the possibility of survival is called into question for hundreds of millions of people in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It is precisely the arms race, where the old militarist thinking tries to "call the tune" in international relations, that shuts up in a bottle labeled "cold war" effective actions to deliver most of humanity from hunger, disease, and poverty.

Sober thoughts are being expressed today in the United States by those who comparatively recently were still sitting in the trenches of "psychological warfare." Former CIA Director William Colby participated in the discussions in Airlie at the invitation of the Federation of American Scientists.

I asked Colby: "How do you see the present and the future of Soviet-U.S. relations?" Colby pondered for a short while and, carefully picking his words, said that the United States and Russia need sober assessments of present-day realities. "We," Colby said, "must avoid erroneous assessments of one another. That is fraught with danger." When I remarked that the plans to extend the arms race to space present the greatest danger

to us all, Colby replied: "The Strategic Defense Initiative will not work, but at the same time it is very dangerous. Moreover, it is money down the drain. It sets us at odds with one another and breeds the sort of reactions that we must avoid." This quite realistic assessment of SDI by a U.S. conservative is shared by an overwhelming number of leading U.S. scientists.

The main impression from my meetings with Americans in April-May 1987 is this: The number of people among them who believe that by joint efforts the USSR and the United States can build a world without wars is increasing. The members of the Californian organization called "World Without War" spoke about this with the greatest conviction. Their credo is: "We all live on the same planet. It is our common home. Now it is a question of the very existence of mankind and life on earth." Will this philosophy spread in the United States, will it take root? Only time will tell.

But in the United States it is impossible not to see another fact also: the record military budget and the activation of rightwingers like George Will, who are using the mass media to meaningfully remind President Reagan who brought him to power.

Yes, the United States today, as always, is many-sided in its sympathies and antipathies. The kaleidoscope of U.S. political life is constantly moving and changing. [paragraph continues]

The question of whether a time of changes for the better has come in the United States will only be answered when Washington takes real advantage of the unique chance to consolidate peace. The Reagan Administration has already let it slip once. Will it do so again?

/9738

CSO: 5200/1522

END